FEB 4 1957

Presented to
United
Theological Seminary
Library
Dayton, Ohio

by

Dr. C. W. Brewbaker

C. W. Brewbaker

Dayton Ohio

1920

THE SUPERNATURAL JESUS

GEORGE W. McDANIEL, D.D., LL.D.

THE SUPERNATURAL JESUS

BY

GEORGE W. McDANIEL, D.D., LL.D.

Author of "Seeing the Best," "The Churches of the New Testament," "The People Called Baptists," "Our Boys in France," "A Memorial Wreath," etc.

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
BT
201
.M19
1924
38,241

NEW YORK
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

COPYRIGHT, 1924,
BY THE SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD
OF THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION

THE SUPERNATURAL JESUS
— B —
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To the memory

of

MY MOTHER

EB 4 1957 UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

INTRODUCTION

This is a book of discussions, rather than of sermons. While homiletical form has not been adhered to, it is believed that what is here presented furnishes homiletical material. The purpose has been to adduce facts and deduce conclusions from those facts; to discuss the evidence in the hope of leading inquiring minds to truth, unsettled minds to certainty, and believing minds to a fuller appreciation of the Supernatural Jesus.

The humanity of Jesus is generally admitted. Therefore, that aspect of Jesus has been dealt with only incidentally. It seemed unnecessary to dwell upon what all concede. The deity of Jesus is denied. That is, in reality, the crux of the controversy now raging between two schools of thought. The denying school is called "Modernists" by accommodation. They are not modern in the sense that they represent anything new. Long ago Renan expressed their views more attractively, Strauss more forcefully, Socinus more logically, Arius more subtly, and Celsus more originally. "Fundamentalists" is the name chosen by the other school, but that is not sufficiently definite.

The suggestion was made recently by a literary

man that the names Literalists and Liberals were the correct designation. This, however, must be rejected, for the Literalists believe in the spiritual interpretation of those passages of Scripture which are spiritual, and the Liberals have displayed, at times, an illiberality little short of intolerance.

The words "Modernists" and "Liberals" are used in this book to designate the same persons, though neither term is quite satisfactory. Sometimes they are designated Unitarians. I prefer to think of myself as a Realist—one who looks facts in the face and takes them at their face value. Best of all, I prefer the name "Christian" with all of its implications.

Substantially all we know about Jesus is in the New Testament. Four authors, Pliny, Tacitus, Clement, and Josephus, who lived in the first century, refer to him, but their references are brief and corroborate the New Testament. The four Evangelists and Paul are the main authorities for what is to be known about Jesus. To ascertain what they actually represent as to the Supernatural Jesus has been my study; so to state the facts as to appeal to the people generally is my purpose.

It has seemed inadvisable to load the discussions with citations outside the original source. This could easily have been done, but the opinions of men in this case have real value just as they are formed upon the evidence. I have gone

directly to the evidence with the view of securing an intelligent, individual verdict from every one who reads the book. John Marshall, as a practicing attorney, weighed the evidence and argued it in the light of the law, without extensive citations from court decisions; that was also his method in rendering decisions as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. That, in the main, is the method pursued in these chapters.

That Christ is historical is assumed. When the precocious John Stuart Mill, a man apparently utterly deficient of a religious nature and professedly devoid of a religious belief—a practical Atheist—could write: "It is no use to say that Christ as exhibited in the Gospels is not historical," it would seem that we are justified in that assumption in this book.

The last chapter, The Truth About Science and the Bible, is added at the request of a group of cherished Richmond ministers who have induced me to publish this volume.

The first five chapters were written while Dr. J. H. Farmer of McMaster University was sojourning in Richmond, and I am grateful to him for reading them and making valuable suggestions. The other chapters were written earlier and not reviewed. It is my prayer that the Holy Spirit, without whom no one can call Jesus Lord, will use this book to the glory of the Supernatural Jesus.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	According to Matthew	15
II	According to Mark	37
III	According to Luke	52
IV	According to John	60
V	According to Paul	85
VI	The Virgin Birth	110
VII	The Resurrection of Jesus	132
VIII	The Deity of Christ	164
IX	The Mistakes of the Modernists . .	174
X	The Truth About the Bible and Science	188

THE SUPERNATURAL JESUS

THE SUPERNATURAL JESUS

I

ACCORDING TO MATTHEW

The gospel by Matthew is a trustworthy and credible presentation of Jesus as the Messiah. Simon Greenleaf has convincingly demonstrated that its genuineness admits of as little doubt, and is susceptible of as ready proof, as that of any ancient writings whatever. The burden of proving any apparently ancient document to be spurious is upon the objector; no one has proven or can prove that Matthew did not write the first gospel earlier than the year 64. On the other hand, there is sufficient reason to accept it as authentic.

The anti-Pharisaic spirit of the book; the sanctity ascribed to Jerusalem and the high veneration for the temple; the prominence predicted for Peter and the Church; and the general cast of the argument for the Messiah, indicate that the book was written quite early by a Jew and to the Jews.

The author had been a tax collector. The Romans extracted oppressive tribute, direct and indirect, from Judea. The rate on merchandise ran as high as an eighth part of the value of the

commodity. The direct taxes consisted of a capitation tax, and a land-tax, based upon a census which was taken every fourteen years. Now, the increase of taxes multiplies discontent and leads to evasion and fraud. How much more so when the taxes were imposed by a conqueror and by a heathen! To collect these taxes required vigilance, scrutiny, severity. Matthew was familiar with many varieties of imposture, cunning, deception and fraud. In the discharge of his official duties he would become habitually watchful, suspicious, cautious and scrutinizing. The degree of improbability is high that such a man could be deceived in regard to the facts about Jesus; either those which he learned from others or himself observed.

Keeping these facts in mind, examine the Gospel of Matthew with a view to ascertaining if he presented Jesus as a supernatural person. The subject of the inquiry is not one of mathematical truth, something susceptible of demonstration beyond the possibility of error. It is not one of scientific knowledge, for science deals with the material and this one deals with moral and spiritual truth. This inquiry is as to a matter of fact and proof of matters of fact rests upon moral evidence alone. The rule of law upon this subject is: "A proposition of fact is proved, when its truth is established by competent and satisfactory evidence." The foundation of our religion is a basis of fact—the fact of the birth,

ministry, miracles, death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ. What does Matthew say about that fact?

The Genealogy of Jesus. Matthew's main purpose was to satisfy the Jews that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah of the Old Testament. It had been predicted that Messiah would be a descendant of David. Matthew proves this by tracing the genealogy of Joseph, the *legal* father, to David; and to make his case more impressive, he goes back to Abraham, the father of the Jewish race, to whom the promise of Messiah was given; Gen. 17:7. It is not merely a man, Jesus, whose legal lineage is traced through forty-two generations; it is "Jesus Christ," the official, anointed One. Verse sixteen of the genealogy differs from the preceding verses. They state that Jesse begat David, Solomon begat Rehoboam and so on. Without an exception the verb "begat" is used. When we come to Joseph and Jesus the verb is not used. It says: "Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ." The Evangelist altogether departs from the usual phraseology in the case of Joseph and Jesus. They are not connected as father and son. Let the Modernists explain that small but vital change. It can mean but one thing; Jesus was not begotten of natural generation. The peculiarity of the Savior's birth is clearly indicated. Those who quote the Syriac manuscript, that "Joseph begat Jesus," are asked to harmonize that with verses

eighteen and nineteen of the same chapter in that manuscript. The Modernists would have been more careful than the Ebionite editor who altered only one verse; they would have edited the three verses to make them conform to their theory of a natural Jesus.

The Miraculous Birth. The fact of a peculiar generation indicated in the genealogy is fully stated in the birth-account which immediately follows. The author announces his purpose to tell of the birth of Christ and gives the details in eight verses; half as many words and more than two-thirds as much space as he gives to the forty-two preceding generations. The conception by the Holy Spirit; Joseph's painful perplexity, conscientious unselfishness, and due deliberation; God's comforting intervention and assuring revelation that the babe should be the personal Savior; and Joseph's acquiescence and subsequent conduct are seen; and all in such a light as to make prominent the essential things; the virginity of the mother and the supernaturalness of the child.

The nature of this Incarnation is an unfathomable mystery. The fact is historically certain and unspeakably glorious. It was the initial earthly event in human redemption. Atonement and Intercession consummated that redemption. Without these mysteries redemption is impossible. They are God's blessed and beautiful way of accomplishing man's salvation. We accept and act

daily upon facts the nature of which we cannot explain or even comprehend. Why should we not be as consistent in religion? Faith and experience are vital to the knowledge of Jesus as Savior. To quote Lord Bacon: "There is no other entrance to the Kingdom of man, which is founded upon the sciences, than to the Kingdom of heaven, into which no one can enter but in the character of a little child."

Modernists are the theological descendants of Faustus Socinus who held that Jesus was merely a man. However, Socinus maintained that he was supernaturally born of a virgin. The rationalistic Modernists will not concede this; they say that Jesus was in all respects subject to ordinary natural laws. Matthew teaches that his birth was above such laws, that it was a virgin birth, the Incarnation of God. The Incarnation is essential to Christian theology. Doctrinally, it is next in importance to his death and resurrection. Practically, it dignified motherhood, glorified babyhood, and exalted manhood.

The Infant King. Micah had foretold that Messiah should be born in Bethlehem: "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting," Micah 5:2. Isaiah had prophesied that Gentiles would come with gifts to him: "And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to

the brightness of thy rising . . . they shall bring gold and incense; . . . and they shall shew forth the praises of the Lord," Isa. 60:3, 6. Isaiah had also foretold his dual nature: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace," Isa. 9:6. Balaam had prophesied: "There shall come a Star out of Jacob," Num. 24:17. Hosea had, under the figure of national Israel as a "son," foretold the return of the greater Son from Egypt, Hosea 11:1. Jeremiah had foretold the mothers weeping for their slain babes: "Thus saith the Lord; A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation, and bitter weeping; Rachel weeping for her children refused to be comforted for her children, because they were not," Jer. 31:15. Matthew shows how those six prophecies were fulfilled in the infant king of the Jews, 2:1-16.

This is Matthew's account of the first presentation of the Messiah to the nation and their rejection of him. The attention of civil and religious rulers was called to him by the Magi. His first appellation from human lips is the words of the Magi: "Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" Their visit was to the Spiritual King of the earth,—theirs as much as the Jews'. It was a microcosm of Christ's work. We see in Herod's slaughter of the innocents the beginning of that

unrelenting enmity which culminated in the death on Calvary and continued in religious persecution; and in the Gentiles with their gifts, we see the first of that long procession of worshipers of the Savior whom his own people slew. Never was a birth so foretold or foretelling. It fulfilled the past and it presaged the future.

The Heralded King. Matthew's second presentation of the Messiah is in the herald, John the Baptist. This had been foretold by Isaiah: "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God," Isa. 40:3. The appearance and ministry of John, the baptism and temptation of Jesus, are related in a simple and straightforward way. Read the biographies of the World Rulers and where will you find such a spiritual preparation; such a modest, righteous, and prophetic entrance on official work; such heavenly approval of the new King; such a triumph of character over temptation? The highest things are in the voice at the baptism: the highest preacher, God; the highest pulpit, heaven; the highest plaudit, "My beloved son." Jesus was attested by revelation,—the open heavens; by inspiration,—the spirit descending like a dove; by approval,—the voice of the Father.

Jesus was tested as Son of man, Son of God, and the Messiah. He met every test. As Son of man, the temptation was addressed to the first and most necessary of human desires—hunger.

He refused to satisfy hunger in a way not ordained of God. He would live no life not sustained by the word of God. As Son of God, the temptation was to the most sacred of holy things, —his divine sonship. He refused to act upon his own impulses, to make a spectacular appeal to the nation, to tempt God under the guise of claiming a promise of Scripture. As the Messiah, the temptation was addressed to his personal and official objective,—to win back the world. He refused to adopt Satan's methods to spare himself the toil and pain of the course which God had ordained and which prophecy prescribed. He took the long and costly road by way of the cross.

Arthur was a good king, Victoria a beloved queen, McKinley a kindly president. Did any of these win every battle against natural instincts, spiritual desires and holy ambitions? Alas, neither they nor any other ever did, save One only, the Messiah. All others have fallen somewhere. He was more than conqueror in the wilderness, in the temple, in the mountain, in solitude, in the sanctuary, in society. Must he not have been more than human?

The Marvelous Ministry. Jesus selected Capernaum as the base from which he would conduct his Galilean ministry. He was the great light to them which sat in darkness and in the region and shadow of death, 4:13-17. He called individuals and they personally accepted him as Savior and

Lord, 4:18-25. He spoke to the multitudes in tones of authority, perfecting the law of Moses and enacting laws in advance of the most enlightened modern civilization, 5:20-42. He taught a code of ethics and erected a standard of morality which none but he has attained, 5:48; he warned against false prophets which come in sheep's clothing but are inwardly ravening wolves and said they should be known by their fruits, 7:15-20; he said that the characters of men, the destiny of men, stood or fell as they treated his words, 7:24-27.

The instructions of Jesus in Luke are largely imparted in conversations; in John, in dialogues, in Matthew, in discourses. Study the unity, progress, symmetry and completeness of those discourses, as pointed out by Weston, and the impression will be deepened that no mere man delivered them. You will come to the conclusion of Daniel Webster: "My heart has always assured and reassured me, that the gospel of Jesus Christ must be a divine reality. The Sermon on the Mount cannot be a merely human production." That is his self-framed inscription upon his tomb.

As opposition to Jesus grew he introduced a new method of teaching,—by parables. They concealed the mysteries of his kingdom from the judicial blindness of the Jews and revealed them to the spiritual insight of the disciples. He commences to speak thus in the thirteenth chapter. He has heretofore announced his kingly

character and authority. Matthew has told us that he was greater than David or Solomon, than the law or the temple, and that he has power to forgive sins. Matthew now records how Jesus, by parables, revealed himself as the Christ; the treasure for which one gives all that he hath, the goodly pearl more valuable than all else. Yes, Jesus says all this of himself in beautiful parables. He calls his doctrines mysteries. They are undiscoverable by human reason. Things kept secret from the foundation of the world, he revealed, the supernatural element still remaining despite the revelation. Modernists will not accept what the human reason cannot understand. Jesus says of the Realists, which is the correct antonym for Modernists: "It is given unto you to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven."

Let Mr. H. G. Wells, or Van Loon, or any other literary genius, write parables comparable to those of Jesus. Let the Modernist furthest advanced in knowledge, most highly endowed with the gift of expression, and possessing the finest culture, clothe his best thoughts in the finest forms of which he is capable; put this in a parallel column with the Master's discourse found in the seven parables of Matthew thirteen; and instantly the superiority of the Master will appear. This is more striking when you compare the messages of the American Presidents to Congress with the inaugural address of Jesus to his disciples. There is not one of them in the class with the Savior's

production. The patriotic Washington, the cultured Adams, the philosophical Jefferson, the profound Madison, the versatile Roosevelt, the scholarly Wilson, all men of talent, have not produced anything which so lives in the thoughts of America, so breathes in the lives of the people, as the sentences which Jesus gave forth nearly nineteen centuries ago. Never *man* spake like this man.

The ministry of Jesus was notable for its merciful miracles, no less than for its marvelous messages. Twenty miracles are recorded in Matthew. They are facts full of symbolism, beginning with the cure of leprosy, the symbol of sin, and ending with the withering of the fig tree, the type of judgment. These miracles were not simply displays of power intended to prove Christ's Messiahship. He persistently declined to meet the clamor of the Jews for signs. The miracles of Christ are all of salvation and usually accompanied by faith, or sincere request. They prove that he was the Savior by demonstrating that he can do what he offers to do. They evidence not merely almighty power, but moral perfection. John in prison heard "the works of the Christ." He did not doubt that Jesus was a Messiah, but his works were so different from what John had expected that he sent to inquire if there were to be two Messiahs. Jesus was not using the cleansing fan, the consuming fire, the felling ax. The Master answered by telling John's two emissaries to show John again what he was doing: "The

blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them," Matt. 11:5. He added: "And blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in me," 11:6. The moral character looms in that beneficent ministry.

The wonders of Jesus are wrought without difficulty, or impatience, and are larger and more impressive than other Biblical miracles. Elisha fed a hundred men with twenty loaves, but Jesus fed five thousand with five. Moses smote the sea with his staff, Elijah divided the river with his mantle, Elisha healed the spring with a cruse of salt, but Jesus healed a withered hand by a word (Matt. 12:13) and a leper by a touch (Matt. 8:3); and he wrought in his own name by a power immanent and inherent: "I will; be thou clean." Only once did he use the medium of clay, yet, by other miracles on the blind, without extraneous helps, he plainly showed that the clay was his choice, not a necessity.

Unlike the professed healers of modern times Jesus did his miracles without advertisement or compensation; neither he nor his apostles, who worked in his name, charged the beneficiary. Furthermore, he healed all who came to him. No one ever hobbled to him on crutches and hobbled away on crutches; all who were brought to him with infirmities were able to walk away sound and well.

Imperious Demands. Absolutely astounding are some of the sayings of Jesus. Rejection of him incurred a greater guilt and entailed a darker doom than the flagrant immorality of Sodom. "Then began he to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not: Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment, than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell: for if the mighty works, which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee." Matthew 11:20-24.

No Greek philosopher ever asked of his pupils the surrender to himself which Jesus demanded of those who would be his disciples; "Take my yoke upon you"; be as the docile ox to his owner, bending the neck to the yoke. "If any man will come after me let him deny himself"; not self-denial—the denial of something to self or the denial of one part of self for the gratification of another part, or even for the sake of others, something familiar in all human action—but the utter renunciation of self as Savior and Sovereign, the

death of self as indicated by taking up the cross and going to death with Jesus. Nor did teacher ever promise so much; Ye shall find *rest*,—for the intellect, baffled to know the truth; for the will, wild as the wind; for the conscience, burdened with a load of guilt; for the heart, bruised by sorrow. Ye shall find life; life that is life indeed, in its fullness here and hereafter, the life of Christ who fills the place once occupied by the dead self.

No Roman emperor ever sought heart obedience to himself as Jesus required of his subjects. He tells them that his life is that of an itinerant—he had no abiding place; that his life will be offered up—he has no place to hide from his foes. Men who volunteer to be his disciples, even learned scribes, must be ready to give up life for him. A disciple, with the praiseworthy prompting to perform the highest customary duty of burial of a father, must heed the imperious call of Christ for immediate service, must learn that obligations to him transcend natural affections, 8: 19-22. One who would so speak to-day would be treated with ridicule or scorn. Jesus so spoke and men obeyed him, and men still do for him what they would do for no other. Twelve men, without purse or weapon, went forth at his command into a hostile world, went forth as sheep in the midst of wolves, with no support or protection save the promise of Jesus. Hundreds of our choicest young men and women have left father and

mother, sister and brother, safety and comfort, and gone forth at Jesus' command to preach the kingdom of God.

In harmony with Christ's demands upon others is his repudiation of earthly kinship. Once his mother and his half-brothers sought to interfere with him, 12:46-50. He acted as one of another nature, of a higher origin, under a kingdom compulsion. His kingdom knows no man after the flesh; its relationships are spiritual: "Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother and sister, and mother." He does not mention kinship to an earthly father, for he had none and could not use that analogy. His nobility of birth is not even through Mary; he puts the Father first.

An Indestructible Institution. The word Church, so frequently upon the lips of Christians, was used by Jesus only three times. Matthew alone records the instances, 16:17-18; 18:17. The first mention has an unmistakable bearing upon the deity of Jesus. The ministry and personality of Jesus made various impressions upon men. The conscience-stricken Herod thought he was John the Baptist come to life again. Some, having in mind his severe denunciations and his cleansing of the temple, thought he was Elijah. Others, observing his seriousness and sorrow, the absence of laughter and the flowing of tears, thought he was the weeping prophet Jeremiah. Still others, unable to identify him with any par-

ticular one, said he was "one of the prophets." Jesus was not content with this. Had he been contented he might have been unmolested by the Jews. They slew him because of his persistent claim to be more than a teacher sent from God. He pressed upon the Apostles the inquiry as to what they thought of him. Peter, for the Apostles, formally and officially declared the true relation and office of Jesus: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." There stand the words. Their force is inescapable.

Jesus blessed the man who confessed his deity. More than that, he said the confession was both a revelation and a foundation. God in heaven had made known to Peter the essential nature of Jesus, and upon such confession and out of such material he would build his indestructible and irresistible Church. According to Matthew, the recognition of his unique sonship, his Messianic character, was what Jesus longed for, insisted upon, and commended. By the same Evangelist we also learn that this is what his Church is built upon,—the confession of himself as the son of God. The deity of Jesus is the foundation and those who honestly confess that deity are the superstructure of that divine institution, the Church. He is the chief corner stone and believers are the living stones built upon it, as Peter has particularly explained, I Peter 2:1-9. Paul said: "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ," I Cor. 3:11.

He also said that Jesus Christ was the chief corner stone, Eph. 2:20.

A building is no stronger than its foundation. A Church built upon any other foundation than Jesus Christ, God's only begotten Son, is unstable. A prophet of God, an ethical teacher, a moral exemplar, the best of humans, will not suffice.

"On Christ the solid rock I stand;
All other ground is sinking sand."

Rationalists are digging at the foundations. Make no mistake about that. They will break their picks and weary their arms in vain, unless Christians are guilty of a quiescence which amounts to the guilt of disloyalty.

Jesus contemplated that his institution would continue in existence. He knew the opposition and enmity it would encounter, but he predicted that it would triumph over every foe, even the "gates of hell." He gave regulations of discipline for this Church to be used through all time. The existence of the Church is a living witness to the deity of Jesus. Nations have come and gone. Empires, once mighty, have passed away. Every government on the globe is relatively new. The institution founded by a Galilean peasant within a small province of a World Dominion, lives and grows while that vast empire has crumbled and vanished. It is known only in history:

the Church is the mightiest force for righteousness in the world to-day.

The Unmatched Protagonist. Matthew details the third and final presentation of the Messiah to the Jewish people, 21-23. He appears publicly, riding a colt in fulfillment of prophecy, and is acclaimed by the multitudes. In the consciousness of his Messianic office he drives the traders and perverters from the Temple as he did at his first ministry in Jerusalem. The chief priests and scribes, hearing the shout of the children, demanded that he disclaim the Messianic title and honors which they ascribed to him. Jesus replied that God was pleased with the children's praise: "Thou has brought praise to perfection from the mouth of babes and sucklings."

Jesus then met and overcame in argument all his opponents. Unbelief challenged his credentials. He impaled unbelief upon the horns of the dilemma of either denying that John was a prophet or accepting the forerunner's doctrine. Worldliness, that luxurious bed in which Pharisees and Herodians lay side by side as brothers, sought to seduce him. He put worldliness to confusion by honoring Cæsar as the civil, and God as the spiritual, ruler. Rationalism, that conceited philosophy which denies the resurrection, assailed him with the perplexing question of the relation of husband and wife in the next world. He silenced them by showing their ignorance of the

Scriptures, and of the power of God, and declared that there are no fleshly relationships in heaven. Formalism, old foe to spirituality, mustered its forces and tested him with a question about the greatest commandment. With the stroke of a master he summarized the ten commandments in two, which include all duties to God and to man and turned upon them with the question: "What think ye of Christ, whose Son is he? They say unto him, The Son of David. He saith unto them, David called Christ Lord. How is he then David's son? And no man was able to answer him." To this day no man who accepts David's Psalm can explain it intelligibly except by accepting Jesus as the Messiah, David's Lord and ours. Thus had this One who was more than man, successively and successfully met unbelief, worldliness, rationalism and formalism as represented by their ablest exponents. His words, deeds, and personality are still the sufficient answer to all doubt, all denial and all opposition.

The Crowning Miracle of Grace, Might and Glory. Death comes as a surprise to many men; it was expected by Jesus from the beginning. No one looks forward to a violent death from his enemies; Jesus knew it was to be his lot and said so. Death to us is the consequence of sin; death to Jesus was the suffering of the sinless for the sinner. The grave is the victor over mortals and

in it their bodies return to dust; Jesus predicted that the grave would not hold him, that he would rise on the third day.

The outgoings of the compassion of Jesus in blessed ministries for others were the token of the outpouring of his life for others. Matthew narrates the betrayal, trial, crucifixion and burial as they were foretold in prophecy, 26:47-27:66. The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah is fulfilled therein. A Jewish tailor was accustomed to visit the students in the dormitory of the Theological Seminary at Louisville. A student, familiar with Hebrew, read to the Jew Isaiah fifty-three; the Jew was familiar with that. He next read Matthew's account of the crucifixion of Jesus; the Jew had never heard that. His heart melted and he confessed the fulfillment of the prophecy.

The cross is the mightiest manifestation of grace the sinful world ever had. It says that Jesus would not save himself that he might save us; that to save us he paid the penalty against sin by death of body, and also of soul in the three hours' withdrawal of the Father's presence; that God's verdict of condemnation against us is wiped out for all who accept this supreme act of grace in which the Father sent him and the Son came, to die for us. There is really no saving trust without the cross, and no saving remedy. Men may reverence the character and words of Jesus. They *trust* as their Savior one who loved

them and died for them. Such an one is Matthew's divine Messiah.

Jesus was buried in a notable tomb and Mary Magdalene and the other Mary witnessed the burial, 28:57-61. They could never forget that tomb. The chief priests and Pharisees took every precaution to keep the body securely in the grave. Behold the mightiest miracle of history! An empty tomb and a risen corpse, Matthew 28. Bodies had been raised in the Old Testament and Jesus himself had raised three; but never before, nor since, had one broken the bands of death by a power within himself. The women saw and rejoiced; they held him by the feet and worshiped; they received his message and hastened to tell the disciples to meet him in Galilee. The deceiving Sanhedrin, the suborned soldiers, and the manufactured reports bore the marks of falsity on their face. The eleven disciples met their Master in Galilee and worshiped him, but some doubted. Jesus assured and commanded them: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," Matt. 28:18-20.

That resurrection validated every claim of Jesus to deity; it affirmed the judgment Matthew had previously rendered about him; it confirmed

the faltering faith of his disciples; it impassioned his followers with a zeal to execute the last earthly orders of the Lord; and it accredited to all men the plan of this extraordinary Person to save the world through the redemption he effected on the cross and perfected by his victory over death and the grave.

Such a personality is the one presented by the cautious and scrutinizing Matthew. There is no hint of legend, no intimation of myth. The Jesus of the Modernists is a myth, created by their unscientific criticism and fashioned after their fancy. It cannot be maintained that he was the real Jesus of Matthew, or of the other Evangelists. Our Christ was not a myth but a mystery; not a legend but a fact; not an imaginary but a historical person.

II

ACCORDING TO MARK

Mark, relative of Barnabas and companion of Paul and Peter, wrote the earliest gospel, probably before 60 A.D. His mother was a prominent Christian woman at Jerusalem. Papias and other patristic fathers say that Mark was Peter's interpreter. If that be so, the second gospel is really that of Peter. Internal evidence confirms this theory. The vivid description of the raising of Jairus' daughter, of the Transfiguration, and of the scene in Gethsemane, have the touches of an eye-witness. Peter, together with James and John, was present on those three occasions. James was martyred early; John has written his account elsewhere, and Peter, therefore, is the most probable source of Mark's account. This is the only gospel which tells who reported to Jesus that all men were seeking him (1:36); who mentioned to Jesus the withering away of the fig tree (11:21); and who asked him privately for the sign about the destruction of Jerusalem (13:3 f.); Peter's name is mentioned on those three occasions. Mark has preserved a record of the passing lights and shadows which played upon the countenance of Jesus, 3:5; 7:34; 10:21. This

must have come from an eye-witness. Peter was such.

This gospel is the shortest of the four. It is simple, and direct. The author goes directly to his subject without an introduction. The characteristic word is "straightway."

The theme, according to 1:2-4, is Isaiah's servant of Jehovah. In Isaiah's conception there are two ruling ideas, greatness and lowliness. In Christ's marvelous words and mighty works the greatness is shown; in his passion, the purpose of which is summed up in 10:45, his lowliness is presented. It is not customary to give the genealogy of servants, hence, there is no genealogy by Mark. That was aside from his purpose. He is writing the gospel of deeds rather than doctrines; of works rather than words. His book is full of action, power, achievement,—just the things which appealed to the Romans for whom he wrote especially. Even in 13:32, which is so frequently used to lower our estimate of Christ, the author carefully guards his unique sonship and sets him above men and angels.

We should not expect, in such a book, an elaboration of doctrine. We should expect very much of practice. We should expect to see the humanity of Jesus in action, and so we do. But the nature of Jesus was such that Mark could not write about him and omit the supernatural. It is self-evident; Mark does not endeavor to display it; he does not argue to prove it; he moves along

naturally in his story, and the supernatural, naturally, unavoidably, and inevitably comes to view.

I read the gospel of Mark through at one sitting and marked with pencil the evidences therein of the deity of Jesus. They were numbered carefully. Fifty evidences were noted with no attempt to magnify them. Let any unbiased person read that book reverently with the aim of getting the author's conception of the supernatural in the life and character of Jesus. Let him breathe the prayer that the Holy Spirit may guide him into the truth. He will, I candidly believe, lay down the book with the conviction that he had read of one who was more than man.

As suggestive of the wealth of material take:

The Author's Personal Statements. The very first sentence is: "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God." Mark does not go to the beginning of eternity as does John, nor to the beginning of Jesus' time-life as does Luke. Therefore, there is no genealogy or infancy, for such is foreign to his purpose. He begins with the official life and ministry of Jesus, and portrays the fullness of his working energy. Still, he must say the "gospel of Jesus Christ," the glad tidings of the Messiah, the one anointed as "Prophet, Priest and King." Not only this but also, "the Son of God." Matthew, writing for Jews, goes back to David and Abraham. Mark, writing for Gentile Christians, introduces us at

once to the Son of God. That is his first conception of Jesus, and the last glimpse he gives is consistent with the first. Did ever the biographer of a man, even of a hero, or saint, begin with such ascription of divinity?

John the Baptist was "great in God's sight" and generally regarded as a prophet. He said he was unworthy to unlatch the sandals of Jesus; that Jesus was mightier than he; that he baptized in water but Jesus should baptize in the Holy Spirit. The lowest man on earth would not use this language of the highest man on earth. The highest man of his day used this language of Jesus. What is the inescapable implication of the Baptist?

The Attestation of the Father. During Jesus' earthly ministry the heavenly voice spoke three times in tones which the bystanders could hear. Mark records the two which were specific attestations. At the baptism: "Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." At the Transfiguration: "This is my beloved Son: hear him." On the first occasion the voice was to Jesus, and on the second occasion it was to the three apostles. On both occasions it was God's witness to the Unique Sonship of Jesus. What higher character could testify? What more positive testimony could be given?

The Confession of Demons. Three times in the gospel of Mark demons acknowledged the deity of Jesus. In Capernaum: "I know thee who thou

art, the Holy One of God," 1:24. By the sea: "And unclean spirits, when they saw him, fell down before him, and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God," 3:11. In Gadara: "What have I to do with thee, Jesus thou Son of the most high God," 5:7. There is no use to debate about demoniacal possessions, nor to cavil that this is a cheap citation of doubtful proof-texts. What mean those confessions? Were such ever so made upon the approach of the best of men? The demons knew the holiness and divinity of him whose presence was their destruction and torment. The deity of Jesus may be denied in the house of the Modernists, but down in the slums are the fallen and abandoned who, like the demons of old, will tell you, if you ask them, that Jesus was the Holy Son of God.

The Belief of Others. Leprosy is a loathsome and incurable disease, common to Palestine. The leper was hedged about and isolated by laws to protect from contagion. With covered lip, bare head and rent garments, he stood aloof from the healthful, and being approached called out, "Unclean, unclean, unclean." Mark tells how a leper came to Jesus "beseeching him, and kneeling down to him, and saying unto him, If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean," 1:40. That leper saw in Jesus the only person whom he dared approach and believed that within the will of Jesus was a power above all medical skill. Jesus touched him and willed and the leper was clean.

"At thine approach, O Holy Son of God,
The loathsome leprosy, affrighted, fled;
The man, new-made, moved back again to life
Like Lazarus, the risen from the dead."

Who was this Being in whom purity overcame defilement; health, sickness; and life, death? What was the nature of him who stayed dissolution, purified the poisoned spring and cured living death? Why does not Modernism, with all its boasted skill and professed superiority, bring forth from its ranks just one who can match this deed of the Christ? Can the combined and concentrated wills of all their "enlightened minds" effect just one such cure? This man believed that Jesus had the power to make him clean. Fortunately, for him the poisonous effluvia of Modernism had not weakened faith in a supernatural Jesus.

There were speculative theories about Jesus when he lived, as there are now. The world had various views of him. They were not satisfactory to his heart because they were untrue to his nature. He supremely wished the understanding and loyalty of those closest to him. He propounded the momentous question: "Whom do ye say that I am?" Peter, ready spokesman of the Apostles, made the ever memorable reply: "Thou art the Christ," 8:29. Peter's gospel does not mention the Master's approval or promise to him. His modesty has left that for Matthew to record; but he will not omit his conception of Jesus as the

Messiah. How can Unitarians, who live nineteen hundred years after Jesus, better interpret his nature than Peter who knew him intimately in the flesh?

In addition to the belief of the leper and Peter, consider, among the many witnesses which are found in Mark, one other,—the centurion. One loves to think of the centurions in the New Testament. There are four; Julius, who treated Paul kindly, and saved his life, Acts 17; Cornelius, of admirable traits and saving faith, Acts 10; the one of Capernaum whose faith Jesus praised, Matt. 8:5-13; and the one who superintended the execution of Jesus, Mark 15:39-46. His training in the severe and skeptical Roman army had hardened him. He had probably witnessed death, on the battle-field, in the amphitheater at Cæsarea, in hot-headed insurrections in Palestine. Never had he witnessed such a death as this, a Voluntary Death for the salvation of sinners. He heard the strange cry and was thrilled through and through; he saw the dignified demeanor, the expression of a wondrous power of life and triumph in the hour and article of death; in the ecstasy of awe and wonder he glorified God; in strong conviction he said: "Truly this man was the Son of God." This one was more than Roman heroes and demigods; he was the Son of God. "Yes, if the life and death of Socrates were those of a sage, the life and death of Jesus were those of a god; and the history of Socrates, which no

one doubts, is not as well attested as that of Jesus." (Rousseau).

The Claims of Jesus. The householder demanding fruit from his vineyard (12:1-12) is as strong a claim as one could make to Unique Sonship. It is in the form of a parable, but it has no meaning unless Jesus was God's one, well-beloved Son who deserved reverence. The greatest sin is the rejection of Jesus; the doom of those who reject him is irretrievable. All this Jesus claimed for himself in the parable.

Forgiveness of sins is the prerogative of God. Jesus claimed that right for himself and exercised it (2:1-12). Not even the Pope would say that in himself was such inherent power; he, and the priests, assert that it is a *derived* power. Jesus acts upon his own authority as God.

The high priest put to Jesus the direct question: "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the blessed? And Jesus said, I am: and ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven," 14:61-62. There is the bold, inevitable claim! Jesus has at last openly declared himself the Messiah, the Son of God, the Son of man. He incriminated himself by his open testimony. Caiaphas and the Jews understood his meaning and condemned him to be guilty of death. They would have secured no death sentence against him had he been only the Christ of the Modernists. Because Jesus testified he was more than this, they crucified him.

He swore to his own hurt that he was the Son of God. Would any one, not mentally deranged, do so unless it was the very truth and he was ready to die for that truth?

The Deeds of Jesus. There is in Mark an abundance of material pertaining to the deeds of Jesus. He was Master of mind and matter, of winds and waves, of disease and death. Consider two classes of Mark's miracles; those of feeding the throngs and those of controlling the sea. He fed 5,000 with five loaves and two fishes (6:32-44), and 4,000 with seven loaves and a few little fishes (8:1-9). It is well to emphasize the sympathy of Jesus for the poor, needy and hungry, but it is important also to emphasize his supernatural power to supply them. The sympathetic Jesus was the supernatural Jesus. God is the source of our food and Jesus is God.

Jesus was never upon but one body of water, the sea of Galilee, and he mastered that. Crossing the sea in a boat with the disciples a storm swept down suddenly. Such storms are frequent. In 1909 I took a boat on the southeast coast of the lake. The wind was still and the water placid. Within fifteen minutes a squall was brewing and the boatman hurried to the shallow shore waters for safety. I understood how the tired Jesus had dropped off to sleep in the calm, and the storm had quickly frightened his disciples. The winds were tossing the waters in the boat and Jesus slept on. Jesus was a good sleeper. His

conscience was clear, his nerves steady. The disciples, in excitement and fear, awoke him with a plea for help. He arose calmly and rebuked the wind as one does barking dogs; the dogs sometimes continue to bark when we speak, but the wind ceased at his command. He spoke to the sea and the tempestuous waves lay down like timid lambs at his feet. There was a great calm. The disciples in amazement said one to another: "What manner of man is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?" 4:41.

That same sea became as pavement under his feet one dark and stormy night as he walked over its heaving bosom to his toiling disciples and comforted them with "It is I, be not afraid," 6:27. He is the "Wondrous Sovereign of the Sea"; he regained the supremacy which Adam lost and which no other has possessed; he is mightier than wind and waves, the forces and elements of nature are subject unto him.

The only escape from the deity of Jesus is a denial of the miracles and a repudiation of the truthfulness of the records. We believe both. Our Savior can hear and answer the sinner's agonizing cry and calm his tumultous passions because he is the Lord over all.

"O Jesus, once rocked on the breast of the billow,
Aroused by the shriek of despair from the pillow;
Now seated in glory, the poor sinner cherish

Who cries in his anguish, Save, Lord, or we
perish.

"And, oh, when the whirlwind of passion is rag-
ing,
When sin in our hearts his wild warfare is wag-
ing,
Then send down thy grace thy redeemèd to cher-
ish,
Rebuke the destroyer. Save, Lord, or we per-
ish."

The Predictions of Jesus. On Tuesday of the last week of our Lord's ministry he foretold the destruction of Jerusalem: "Seest thou these great buildings? There shall not be left here one stone upon another, which shall not be thrown down," 13:2. That prediction was fulfilled in the year 70. Titus and his battering-rams destroyed the city. How did Jesus know what would come to pass? Again, later that week in Bethany, Mary anointed him, and he made the remarkable prediction: "Wheresoever the gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, that also which this woman hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her," 14:9. Put yourself in the historical situation and get the full force of those words. A man, soon to die, is in the home of three friends. One of them performs an act of devotion to him. Some complain at the woman's waste and talk sanctimoniously about helping the poor. They

profess to be interested in practical things. This man commends the woman, and announces that his gospel shall be preached everywhere and that this simple deed of this woman shall live in the universal preaching of that gospel. Behold, before our twentieth century eyes, the fulfillment of that prophecy to the letter!

The Resurrection of Jesus. Three times in Mark Jesus had plainly said he would rise from the dead, 9:36; 10:34; 14:28. Every time he foretold his death he coupled with it his resurrection. His hearers did not understand him. It was hard enough to comprehend that their Lord should die; that he should rise again was *beyond* their comprehension. The women went to the tomb in the early morning expecting to find the dead body. They found the tomb empty and received the announcement: "He is risen; he is not here: behold the place where he lay," 16:1-8. That is the most stupendous of miracles. It was a bodily resurrection. His body was gone. The women were invited to see for themselves. They saw and trembled and were amazed. Metaphysical dissertation about "a spiritual resurrection" cannot explain that empty tomb nor account for the body of Jesus. The risen body was the identical body which Joseph and Nicodemus buried, only mortality had put on immortality. The physical body was glorified.

The remaining verses in Mark, 16:9-20, are not found in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts.

However, they are quoted "by Irenæus and Hippolytus in the second or third century," a date earlier than the oldest manuscripts. Their contents are also corroborated by other gospels. We may treat them as Scripture. These are, then, accounts of the risen Christ as seen by Mary Magdalene (Vs. 9), by two as they walked (Vs. 12), and by the eleven (Vs. 14). This is not a worked-up belief; not a myth invented by enthusiastic followers; not a fraud palmed off upon credulous disciples. The whole situation shows how reluctant the disciples were to accept the fact of the resurrection; how prone they were to disbelieve Mary and the two; how the Master "upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart." Those disciples were like the Modernists in one respect; they doubted the miracle. They were unlike them in other respects; they became fully convinced and were foremost in contending for this crowning miracle.

The Authority of Jesus. The Master invited men to come with him and they straightway left their business, families and friends and companied with him, 1:16-20. He passed by the seat of custom and spoke two words to the Collector: "Follow me." The official quit his post without formally resigning and followed Jesus, 2:12. Abram's call and obedience did not more strongly establish monotheism, than did the conduct of the fishermen and Matthew evidence the deity of Jesus. That they all had previous contact with

him only strengthens the evidence. The government with all its authority could not secure more prompt action from men. No living man can so influence men to-day. Jesus, with no temporal power to support him, spoke and men heeded, and hazarded all. His invitation was more compelling than the imperious command of others. Men are accepting his invitations to-day and by their salvation and service are attesting his deity.

Not only did Jesus invite men to *come to* him; he commanded them to *go for* him. "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned," 16:15 f. The import of that command is tremendous. Jesus had no military organization, no material funds, no earthly office, but he orders like a king. The destiny of men hinges upon their treatment of his gospel. His orders were obeyed and his gospel was believed. This is an insoluble mystery upon any assumption other than that he was God. Men are now going with the gospel message into the dark places of the earth. They are men who have accepted the gracious invitation of the Divine Savior and have heard the authoritative voice of the Risen Savior. Those who deny his deity, or speculate about his person, are found in comfortable pulpits at home, not down among the depraved masses of darkest heathenism, en-

deavoring to reach and enlighten and save them by uplifting the cross on which the Prince of Glory died.

"Ye Christian heralds! go proclaim
Salvation through Immanuel's name;
To distant climes the tidings bear,
And plant the Rose of Sharon there."

III

ACCORDING TO LUKE

Luke was a scholar. His literary attainments were varied; his scientific culture was high. It is certain that he was the author of the third gospel. He wrote it before he did the Acts. Probably the date of the book was A.D. 60 and the place of its writing Cæsarea.

Luke was not a Jew and, hence, was not looking for a Messiah. He was an educated Greek, a medical man, who disbelieved in heathen myths and abhorred the emperor-worship. He lived too near the time of Jesus to be imposed upon by legends and near enough to get the facts from eye-witnesses.

This man set out seriously to write a history of Jesus. He studiously gathered the material, carefully arranged it and wrote it down accurately. The gospels by Mark and Matthew; the oral testimony of ministers, notably James, who were with Christ from the beginning of his ministry; and Mary, the Mother of Jesus, are probably sources used by Luke. In the introduction to his gospel he employed a word which means that he completed his research and sifted the evidence before he began to write and that he did it by constant application. He says his purpose

in writing was that his friend Theophilus might fully and clearly know, without tripping, the matters about which he was writing. The most careful and polished introduction to any history is the first five verses of Luke's gospel. Sir William Ramsay ranks Luke first among historians, even ahead of Thucydides.

What one so competent and careful, so scholarly and scientific, so orderly and accurate has to say upon the deity of Jesus should arrest the attention and provoke the thought of all serious persons. What does he say upon that subject?

He says Jesus was born of a *parthenos.* That is the one word in the original language for virgin. The Parthenon, the temple of the virgins, was derived from this word. It means a virgin and nothing else. It means a virgin *even if married.* In Mary's case she was unmarried but betrothed. Luke, in his genealogy of Jesus through Mary, guards his deity. He does not say he was the son of Joseph but implies that he was not in the words "as was supposed." The Unitarians overlook that explanatory clause. He had already shown that Jesus was not the real son of Joseph.

It was naïvely suggested from a pulpit recently "that with the discovery of older New Testament manuscripts the few verses which refer to the virgin-birth may be entirely eliminated." Did not Luke know as much about the facts as any Modernist ever can find out by "discovery"?

The Modernists, when they cannot disprove, ask you to assume a state of suspended judgment, to wait for what they hope may be found to discredit the history of Luke. The utmost they can present at present is "a very old Syriac manuscript" which, they claim, is older than the earliest manuscripts of the four gospels and which they cite to disprove Luke. But they neglect to say that that manuscript flatly contradicts itself, that it contains the two verses in Matthew 1:18-20 which give the virgin birth. The ablest Greek scholar of my acquaintance says: "It is evident that some scribe, probably Ebionite or Cerinthian Gnostic, changed the text in Matthew 1:16 to get rid of the superhuman birth and deity of Jesus, but failed to alter 1:18-20." The New Testament cannot be handled as the Ebionites and Modernists handle it. It must be taken at its face value; it must be allowed to say what it says and to mean what it means; or else, it must be rejected *in toto* as untrustworthy.

Luke says that John the Baptist should be filled with the Holy Spirit from his birth, but Jesus should be begotten of the Holy Spirit. John was born before his enduement by the Holy Spirit, but the humanity of Jesus was formed by the agency of the Holy Spirit. He calls Jesus and Adam both the Son of God, but while God created Adam he begot Jesus by the Holy Spirit. Adam was God's offspring in the sense that all men are. Jesus was an incarnation of God. Luke calls the

unborn child "holy," free from all taint of sin, and the life of Jesus verified the prediction. Bruce well says: "A sinless man is as much a miracle in the moral world as a virgin birth is a miracle in the physical world." Even the enemies of Jesus admit this moral miracle. On *a priori* ground there is no more rational way of accounting for it than that historically accredited to us by Luke, namely, by a virgin birth.

Again, Luke states that Elizabeth greeted Mary, before Jesus was born, as "the mother of my Lord." The word for "Lord" is the one commonly found in the Septuagint for Jehovah. Elizabeth knew the nature of the child and Luke knew the meaning of Greek. And Luke says the shepherds heard the babe of Bethlehem described as "a Savior, who is Christ the Lord." What high dignity, even deity, is thus ascribed to the babe! Simeon's revelation is in harmony with the announcement to the shepherds; he should not die before he had seen "the Lord's Christ."

At the age of twelve, Luke states, Jesus had a Messianic consciousness. He said to Mary and Joseph: "I must be in my Father's house." He expressed surprise that they did not understand. At his baptism and at the Transfiguration Luke records that God confirmed this peculiar relation of Jesus to himself—God called him his "belovèd Son."

According to Luke, Jesus did not dispute the point raised by the Pharisees, viz: that none but

God could forgive sins; but accepted the challenge and exercised his authority to forgive sins and allowed them to conclude that he claimed that prerogative which belonged to God alone.

Luke also records the supreme authority of Jesus over the Sabbath. That was a new idea to the Pharisees who enslaved men by the Sabbath. Jesus professed power to change the day, and history proves that he did so change it after his resurrection.

On an occasion, Jesus, after a season of prayer, asked his disciples who the crowds said he was, Luke 9:18-22. They gave the current opinions: that he was John the Baptist, Elijah, or an old prophet come to life. Jesus put the inquiry to them personally. What was their personal opinion? Peter answered for himself and the others: "The Christ of God." Thereupon, Jesus confided to them the intelligence of his approaching death and foretold that he would be raised up the third day. Peter confessed that Jesus was the Messiah, the same one whom Simeon saw and was ready to depart in peace. Jesus accepted Peter's appellation.

Luke's account of the return of the seventy tells of Jesus' exultation in the Holy Spirit. In that moment he uttered words as strong as any found in John: "All things have been delivered unto me by my Father, and no one knows who the Son is except the Father and who the Father is except the Son and he to whom the Son wills to

reveal him." Mark you, it is not the theologian, but the historian, who writes this narrative. Jesus was a madman or he was the unique Son of God in whose will our destiny lies.

Read the last paragraph in the twenty-second chapter of Luke. Jesus is before the Sanhedrin the second time. In daylight he affirms what he had said at night. The Sanhedrin ratifies, by a second vote, its previous action. That action was that Jesus claimed to be the Son of God, that such a claim was blasphemy, and that he should be put to death upon his own testimony. Jesus, then, was executed for his claim of deity.

Turn now to the twenty-fourth chapter of Luke. There this man, who has given us a physician's account of the wonderful birth, gives us a detailed account of something more wonderful and vital, the resurrection. This event refreshed forgetful minds, revived dying hope, confirmed faltering faith, and kindled waning enthusiasm. Jesus appeared again and again to his disciples. He expounded from the Old Testament the things concerning himself, made himself unmistakably known, commanded them to evangelize among all nations, promised the enabling power of the Paraclete and went back where he was before the miraculous conception. "And they worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy. And they were continually in the temple, praising and blessing God."

The Modernists' world would be one without

much religious joy. No praising God for victory over the tomb, but a lonely grave on which the pitying Syrian stars looked down. No happy Christmas time in celebration of the birth of the Prince of Peace, of Immanuel (God with us), but a cold and cheerless winter night.

"It is a lonely Christmas night,
No angels singing in the height,
No shepherds and no guiding light;

"No royal train to follow them
With incense, myrrh, and diadem,
No star-lit stall in Bethlehem:

"No Virgin Mother, undefiled,
Holds to her heart her Holy Child;
Not so can reason be beguiled.

"New science brings the world new light,—
It *seems* so wise: it *must* be right,—
But,—'tis a lonely Christmas night."

Luke, more justly renowned for scholarship than any of the Modernists, better informed about Jesus than any of the critics, gives us a Jesus who was not "the mere divinity of humanity" but God's only begotten, His beloved, Son who snatched victory from the grave and ascended as miraculously as he descended. Luke's Jesus is our Jesus,—the Jesus of devout scholarship and reverent science; the Jesus whose birth was an occasion of rejoicing and whose triumph over

death is the source of perpetual rejoicing,—in life, death, and the hereafter.

"But now Thou art in the Shadowless Land,
Behind the light of the setting sun;
And the worst is forgotten which Evil planned,
And the best which Love's glory could win is won."

IV

ACCORDING TO JOHN

We are in the Holy of Holies of the New Testament when we enter the gospel of John. It was written the last of the four, and near the close of the first century. Its author was one of the first two disciples to follow Jesus and the last of the apostles to die. He knew Jesus intimately from the beginning of his ministry. In the evening of life he recalled the very hour of the day when he and Andrew first followed Jesus: "It was about the tenth hour," 1:39.

It is lamentably true that the gospel by the apostle of love has been the object of the most vehement attacks. Its authorship, date and doctrine have all been fiercely assailed. Should any of my readers join arms with the assailants of this gospel he is respectfully referred to the testimony of Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement, Theophilus, Apollinaris, Polycrates, Justin Martyr, and Ignatius, all of whom were familiar with the fourth gospel. "Every decade of the second century furnishes its share of proof that the four Gospels as a whole, and John in particular, were to the Church of that age what they are to the Church of the present" (Liddon). "At this moment the facts before us are such that no man

who does not will knowingly to choose error and to reject truth, can dare say that the fourth Gospel is not the work of the Apostle John'' (Ewald). We accept John's authorship as proved and his pages as accurate.

John differs from the Synoptists in certain respects: 1. The scene of activity is mostly at Jerusalem. 2. Events are grouped differently. 3. Matters are recorded which are not found elsewhere. The dialogues with Nicodemus and the woman of Samaria, the discourses at the Feast of Tabernacles, and the hallowed incidents of chapters fourteenth to seventeenth, are examples. 4. The thought is more philosophical and the connection more subtle. It is profound and yet expressed in simple terms. 5. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish whether Jesus, or the Baptist, or the author is speaking, 3:31-36. 6. The supernatural nature and mission of Jesus appear fully from the first. 7. It is supplemental to the Synoptics, contemplative in mood, interpretative in aim, and polemical in method.

The author is not writing a biography of Jesus. Luke came nearer to that than any other. Yet, in truth, none of the gospels is so much a biography as the presentation of a Personality and his saving mission. John expressly disclaims the completeness of his writings and in the same connection avows their purpose: ''And many other signs daily did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these

are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name," 20:30 f. We should expect, therefore, not to find in John many things recorded in the other gospels and to find especially that which leads to saving faith in Jesus as the Son of God.

The Eternal Son. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God," 1:1 f. That antedates the first verse in the Bible. Genesis tells of an act done in the beginning; John tells of a Being existing in the beginning and, therefore, before the act of creation. Genesis refers to the first moment and event of time; John refers to the eternity which transcends time. Mark opens with the "beginning of the gospel," which is the historical beginning of the public ministry of Jesus; John opens with his existence prior to all history and before the world was. Matthew and Luke record the miraculous entrance of Jesus into the world; John says that before that event he was. The Arians, in later times, held that there was a time when the Son was not; John says positively that he existed before time.

John's Jesus was the preëxistent Logos—not the intermediate and impersonal logos of Philo, or simply the will of God manifested in action as the memra of the Targums, but rather the Son of God existing from eternity, distinct from the

Father and equal to the Father. He was with God and was God. "The personification of the Divine Word in Philo is metaphysical, in the Old Testament poetical, in John historical" (Plummer). John opposed his personal experience of an eternally Divine Savior to the heresy of Cerinthus who separated the man Jesus from the Aeon Christ. Cerinthus, as the Liberals of our time, contended that Jesus was not born of a virgin; that he was born naturally like a man; that the Aeon Christ descended upon him at his baptism and perfected the virtues of Jesus. John declared that Jesus was always God—after his birth, before his birth, and even before the dawn of time. "The Word is not merely a Divine Being, but He is in the absolute sense God" (Meyer). That is the essential difference between the Logos of John and the Logos of Philo, or the Christ of Liberalism.

The Creative Agent. "All things were made through him; and without him was not anything made that was made," 1:3. God created the universe through the agency of the Son. By emphatic repetition which contradicts the opposite, John declares that all things great and small throughout all space came into being through him. No inferiority is implied any more than where the same preposition is used of the Father "through whom ye were called," I Cor. 1:9. Paul explicitly taught the creative agency and the continuing activity of Christ. He and John say sub-

stantially the same upon this phase of the subject.

The Revealing Personality. God is invisible. Man cannot see the divine essence with the physical eye; should he see it he would die. Jesus revealed God to man. Philip asked to see God. Jesus responded: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," 14:10.

We can know of God's *existence* from nature. This handiwork makes manifest his design and power. What of God's *nature?* Does he love man? Nature does not say so in certain terms. Starvation and pestilence stalk across two hemispheres as these words are written. An earthquake rocks Japan and the greatest catastrophe since the flood is the result. Nature is strong, but often heartless, sometimes cruel, always inexorable. We must have other and fuller revelation of God. Where shall it be had? In John: "And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth," 1:14. We feel the kindness and see the love of God in the incarnate Son. John goes on with the comforting revelation: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten God (correct text W. & H.) who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him," 1:18. Jesus revealed the heart of God. I know God is love because I know Jesus. He was the highest expression of love; "For God so loved the world, that he gave his

only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life," 3:16. Jesus possessed "the totality of the Divine attributes," including love, righteousness, and truth. John stresses the most outstanding one, namely, love, which we had not known without Christ.

The Indispensable One. There are things without which man cannot live and Jesus is and supplies every one of these. Observe how John brings this before us.

1. Life. When life is extinct man is dead. Christ is the source of all life, physical and spiritual: "In him was life."

2. Light. Think what would happen to the world were the sun to go out forever, or for a year. Shut the eye from the light for a length of time and the sight is lost. Light is essential to the material earth and to the bodily eye. Christ is to the intellect and conscience what light is to the earth and eye. "The life was the light of men,"—intellectual and moral light. Christ not merely dwells in light, he is Light in essence, thought and action. He is the religious light which illumines the moral darkness. This is a truth oft repeated by John: "I am the light of the world," 8:12; "As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world," 9:5; "That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world," 1:9; "And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men

loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil," 3:19.

3. Bread. The most universal food is bread. In some form it is eaten everywhere. We call it the staff of life. Jesus said of himself: "I am the bread of life," 6:23. The Synoptists relate the miracle of feeding the five thousand. John alone relates the spiritual interpretation of that miracle in the Master's profound discourse on the bread of life. It is the food which endureth, which a man may eat and not die, the living bread which came down from heaven, the flesh of Christ which he would give for the world and which a man must eat to have eternal life. Necessarily, this eating is not literal but spiritual. This is not my arbitrary or accommodating interpretation. That which is literal must be taken as such no matter how hard it may be. In this instance, however, the Master has instructed us that he spoke figuratively. "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life," 6:64. It is contrary to the Master's own teaching to take the words about eating his flesh and drinking his blood literally, as Martin Luther did, instead of taking them symbolically.

4. Water. One can exist without food longer than he can without water. The value of water may be implied in the fact that two thirds of the earth's surface is covered by water. One who has lived in an arid country appreciates the in-

dispensableness of water. I was born and grew to manhood in a state where streams were scarce and droughts frequent. Though I now live in a state of abundant water I sometimes have horrible dreams of a drought; the cisterns are exhausted, the wells fail, the creeks and springs dry up, the grass withers, the corn fires, and for monotonous months there is no rain. People almost famish; cattle moan piteously and stretch out on the plains with swollen tongues and distended eyes and die the most horrible of deaths—of thirst. Sometimes I dream that I am riding horseback on a long, sandy road, through piney woods, or across vast prairies where there are no dwellings or streams. My lips are parched, my tongue is paper, my saliva is cotton. These dreams come back from the observations and experiences of boyhood. Oh, how terrible to be without water! How sweet and refreshing when thirsty lips taste water!

"If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink," cried Jesus on that last day of the feast, 7:37. "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst," said Jesus to the woman at the well, 4:14. He was in himself what the thirsty soul craved; he gave the satisfying and saving draught. He said that the soul which came to him had two experiences: (1) the soul thirst was quenched, and (2) that soul in turn became a fountain from which life-giving streams flowed. The second was the issue of the

first and was expected always to follow; when Jesus spoke of the first he connected with it the second. Millions have, by personal experience, tested the Lord's promise and found it precious. This alone attests the deity of Jesus. Men have felt and know.

Accredited by Four Witnesses. The biblical rule of evidence required two witnesses (Num. 35:30; Deut. 17:6). Jesus advanced his marvelous claims upon the Jews who denied them. They would say that his testimony must be corroborated. He cited four confirming and corroborating witnesses.

1. The Baptist, "Ye sent unto John and he bore witness of the truth," 5:33. Just precisely what was John the Baptist's witness? It was direct and positive: "I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God," 1:34. What one sees with his own eyes is the best kind of testimony. John the apostle, in his first epistle, said he had seen with his eyes the "Word of Life" and felt with his hands. John the Baptist was promised a designating sign. The promise was fulfilled and he declared that the One he baptized was the Son of God. Previously, John had disclaimed being the Messiah and subsequently he reiterated his disclaimer and reaffirmed his positive declaration that Jesus was the Christ, 3:28-30.

2. The works. "The same works that I do bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me," 5:36. If men hesitated to believe him, Jesus ap-

pealed to his works: "Believe the works," 10:38. Judged by his deeds Jesus was superhuman. The Modernists hold that the miracles are a stumbling-block to faith; Jesus said they were an argument for faith. The Modernists would eliminate the miraculous from the Gospels in order to make their acceptance easier, but they would not then be worth accepting for the moral character of Jesus would be imperilled by destroying his veracity, the Evangelists would be discredited as witnesses, the death of Jesus would mark the greatest failure of history, and mankind would stagger and fall and despair under the hopeless burden of unremovable sin. The works of Christ evidenced his supernatural nature. "Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very works' sake." John 14:11.

3. The Father. Among humans, the one who knows most certainly a son's father is his mother. In the case of Jesus the one who best knew his father was the Father, God. Joseph made no claims. On the contrary, he said the child was not his. Mary did not understand him, but God knew and audibly declared three times that Jesus was His unique Son. Our Savior falls back on the Father's testimony: "The Father himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me," 5:37.

4. The Scriptures. The Jews had the Old Testament in their possession when Jesus came.

They had cumbered it with tradition, to be sure, but behind all their literature and theology were these sacred writings. They read them, memorized them, quoted them. Jesus appealed to these for his credentials: "Ye search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me. . . . For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me," 5:39, 46. The deity of Jesus was latent in the Old Testament; it is patent in the Gospels. It is seen in full splendor in John's Gospel from the opening to the closing words.

The Bold Assertions. The Liberals are fond of saying that Jesus did not profess to be the Son of God in contradistinction to the sonship other men have through creation; and, also, that there was no original Messianic consciousness in Jesus, but he accepted the title late in his ministry and "against his will." This theory has no support in the gospel of John. Early in his ministry occurred the conversation with the woman of Sychar. Then and there Jesus avowed that he was the Messiah: "I that speak unto thee am he," 1:26. The woman was convinced and immediately heralded the marvelous understanding of the Christ. The historical truth is that Jesus was conscious of his Messianic mission when he began to preach, and John the Baptist and John the Apostle confirm his early claims.

At the feast of dedication the Jews pretended

to be very desirous of knowing if Jesus were the Christ and asked to be told plainly. Jesus replied: "I told you, and ye believed not. . . . I and my Father are one," 10:22-30. They were furious at his words and took up stones to stone him. Men may still throw stones at the deity of Jesus, even from pulpits, colleges, and seminaries, but they cannot knock down those potent words: "I and my Father are one." He here asserts that they are one substance. The Modernists' theory that this scripture means that Jesus and God were merely one in moral agreement is disproven by the text and the context. The Jews stone him for making himself God, which they would not have done had he asserted no more than unity of will. Furthermore, Christ does not correct them, but bears the blame. Assuredly, he would have corrected them had their animosity arisen out of a gross misapprehension of his words. An insuperable objection to the reconstructed human Jesus of Modernism is that he is not historical; the Jesus of the New Testament sources is equal with God—there is no historical data for another Jesus, that is, for a Jesus who was not as truly God as he was man.

In that profound discourse (8:12-59) Jesus asserted (1) that if the Jews had known him they should have known God, (2) that they were of this world, but he was not of this world, (3) that they were of their father, the devil, but he proceeded forth and came from God, and (4) that he was

the great I AM. Tested by Jesus' words, that unless men believed in him they should die in their sins, what becomes of universal salvation? Tested by Jesus' words, that some were the children of the devil, what becomes of universal fatherhood? Tested by Jesus' thrice repeated words (24, 28, 59), that he was preëxistent, what becomes of the Jesus of Liberalism? Every Jew understood the significance of the great name, I AM; it meant Jehovah, who thus denominated himself to Moses, Ex. 3:14. Cf. Deut. 32:39; Isa. 43:10. In consequence of his taking to himself this Divine Name the Jews prepared to stone Jesus for blasphemy. The Unitarians allege that the orthodox people killed Jesus. It would be more accurate to say that the Unitarians killed him, killed him because he claimed to be God.

It was an impressive scene when Christ stood before the Roman Governor, Pilate, and was questioned by him. In very fact the prisoner was passing sentence on the judge and announcing principles as fundamental and abiding in Christianity as were the decisions of John Marshall in American jurisprudence. Pilate, a tone of scorn in his voice, said to Christ: "Are *you* the King of the Jews?" In Pilate's sense he was not King; in another sense he was. With a strong emphasis on the personal pronoun, "my," Christ declared that his kingdom did not have its foundation, its origin, in this world and did not draw its power therefrom. Pilate, with a disdainful air, rejoined:

"So then *you* are a king." "Yes," said Jesus, "you say truly that I am a king. For this purpose I was born, and for this purpose I have come into the world—to give testimony for the truth," 19:37 (Weymouth). Moffatt's translation also brings out the force of the Greek: "Certainly I am a king. This is why I was born, this is why I came into the world, to bear testimony to the truth. Every one who belongs to the truth listens to my voice." The verbs used by Jesus, "was born" and "came," are perfects, and express a past event which continues in its effects; they point backward to his previous existence with the Father and prepare for his earthly mission of supporting the Truth; their subject, the pronoun "I," is very emphatic. This sentence of Jesus places him in a solitary position among men; there was none like him before or since.

It is interesting to compare the assertion of Christ before the high priest (Matt. 26:24) with the assertion before the Roman Governor. The first is to the Jews and in the language of prophecy; the second is to a Roman and is in the language of conscience; the first predicts a manifestation of glory in the future; the second affirms a manifestation of truth in the present; each assertion is appropriate to the evoking circumstances. Christ confessed to Pilate that he preexisted, and that he came into the world to be the head of the spiritual kingdom, and to give objective expression to the truth. John was on

the scene and has described the dignified bearing of the Savior and informed us of his bold assertions made in the calmest manner.

> "No mortal can with him compare
> Among the sons of men."

The Human Ascriptions. The first of these ascriptions which I cite is related to the subject just discussed; it involved a claim of Jesus for himself in the estimation in which others held him. "Ye call me Master and Lord, and ye say well; for so I am," 13:13. The Liberalists rejoin that this is nothing more than the ordinary title of respect paid to a rabbi. It is hardly possible that the words did not have a deeper meaning upon the lips of the disciples; they assuredly mean far more in the thought of Jesus. However, I will not stay to argue about this text with the Liberalists. I will ask them to consider and explain another human ascription to Jesus, the one by Thomas: "My Lord and my God," 20:28.

Thomas' words echo the first verse of John and anticipate the purpose of the book as announced near the close, 20:31. They are not an exclamation of astonishment addressed to God. They are undoubtedly addressed to Christ as is evident not only from the preceding "unto him" but also from Christ's reply. They are not the confession of a credulous man. It was hard for Thomas to believe the reports he heard of the resurrection

of Jesus; he said he would not believe without irrefutable proof. He was not an unbeliever,—he had followed Jesus three years; he was not a doubter from indifference (as Pilate), still less from hostility to the truth. He loved truth; though sincerely perplexed, he was anxious and ready to believe the truth; but his understanding demanded evidence. As soon as the evidence was presented he embraced it with joy and uttered that strong confession of faith in the Lordship and Deity of Christ. The Unitarian view cannot be squared with Thomas' confession or Christ's acceptance and approval of that confession. Thomas is an encouraging example for Rationalists, in the best sense of the term. The honest doubter who seeks the truth in the New Testament will find it and be blessed. I would not quarrel with him who is skeptical and *sad* because he is so. I would commend to him Thomas as a precedent and counsel him to

> "Fight his doubts, and gather strength
> To find a stronger faith his own."

Still, there is a higher faith than that which has fought doubt and reached certainty from seeing and weighing evidence; it is the faith which believes without questioning, which holds fast the invisible as seeing him, which clings to Christ as the trusting child to a mother "with undoubting, implicit, unbounded trust and confidence." Christ

said as much: "Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed," 20:29.

The Atoning Savior and Risen Lord. If the eternal Sonship and Messianic consciousness of Christ are evident in the gospel of John from the first, no less so is the fact of his sacrificial death. On successive days the Baptist pointed out Jesus as the "Lamb of God," 1:29, 36. The Lamb of Isaiah fifty-three was directly in John's thought and, indirectly, the Paschal Lamb. Christ was to be slain like the innocent lamb as a means of taking away the sin of the world. He had just symbolized his death, burial, and resurrection by requiring baptism of John; the Baptist did not understand why Jesus should be baptized, but the very next sermon he preached after that baptism was on the text, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." At the first Passover Jesus predicted his death: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up," 2:19. John probably heard him and explained that he spoke of the temple of his body; that the disciples recollected the Master's words afterwards; that their fulfillment confirmed the faith of the disciples in the Old Testament and the word Jesus spoke. Only a disciple could give these details about the disciples' thoughts. A little later Jesus informed Nicodemus that the Son of man must die that men might not perish,

3:14 f. Be it noted that all of this was early in the ministry of Jesus.

At the feast of tabernacles Christ anticipated his death and ascension: "Yet a little while am I with you, and then I go unto him that sent me," 7:33. The discourse on the Good Shepherd, chapter ten, contains very strong evidence of the deity of Christ. The figure of speech is an extended metaphor, as is the discourse on the vine and the branches, chapter fifteen. John has no parables. These two chapters are the nearest resemblances to parables, yet in them the figure and its application are interwoven. They have been called allegories; if so they are the only instances in the Gospels. Whether the figure of the Good Shepherd be an allegory or a metaphor the teaching is positive that Jesus was the Good Shepherd who voluntarily laid down his life for the sheep: "I lay down my life for the sheep. . . . I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again."

The Greeks came to see Jesus. In them he seemed to have glimpsed the coming to him of the Gentile world. But he remembers instantly that this can only come through his death. The corn of wheat must die before the Gentile harvest. He explained the figure of the corn of wheat by another figure which prefigured his death. "And I,

if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me," 12:32. The large space devoted to the death of Jesus in the fourth gospel indicates its importance in the thought of Jesus, and also of John. He has expounded the theology of that death in his first letter. To deal with that is apart from the purpose of this discussion which is confined to the Gospel. But in passing, we may mention: "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin," I John 1:7; and, "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins," I John 4:10. Redemption through the death of Christ is the central truth of Christianity. Around it all others revolve. Christianity was created by Christ. It got its idea of the centrality of the cross from the Gospels, and especially from John. Across the pathway of John's Christ the shadow of the cross fell from the time of baptism, continuing until it deepened into the three hours' blackness of darkness.

John informs us that every time Jesus spoke of his approaching death he predicted his resurrection. Had Jesus been mistaken, his intellectual strength and moral beauty would be seriously impaired and his claim to deity shattered. That he was not mistaken is demonstrated by John in the last two chapters of his Gospel. The risen Christ appeared to Mary, to the ten disciples, to the eleven and to the seven. These four appearances, under the circumstances narrated, are convincing

that the same Jesus whose tender voice had been heard in forgiving the Magdalene, whose benediction of peace had been bestowed upon his disciples, whose sinless body had been torn by nails and spear, and whose authoritative tones had demanded supreme service, was alive and recognizable by those who had known him in the flesh. Their disinclination to believe is a presumption against fraud; their assurance of the resurrection by the evidence vouchsafed them is a guarantee to us of the truthfulness of the account; and the cost they paid for witnessing to the resurrection of Christ is a historical fact which cannot be disputed. All of this is in the record of John, "that disciple whom Jesus loved," who says he was present on three occasions when the risen Lord appeared. Plato was not present the day Socrates had his final talk with his friends. Yet he is the authority for what Socrates said. There is better reason for accepting the personal witness of John than there is for accepting the Phædo. It is more difficult to reject the resurrection, in the light of all the evidence, than it is to believe that the Christ of John rose from the dead. This is the only tenable position for one who accepts the Gospels. Even more, it will be the inevitable conclusion of any one who will, without prejudice, examine the matter by the same rules of evidence which men apply to other matters of fact.

The Object of Faith. Liberalism expatiates upon Jesus as the acme of perfection for which

man is to strive and the exemplar of faith which man is to imitate. It teaches that man should live as Christ lived and believe in God as he believed. But, universal experience teaches that man cannot live sinlessly and that his faith is faulty. Man can neither live sinlessly as Jesus did, nor know God intimately and trust him implicitly as did Jesus. Hume's dictum, that a miracle is contrary to all human experience, is not half so forceful against the miracles, for many people in the Bible experienced miracles, as it is against the Liberalists' position that man must live and believe like Jesus, for no man, in the Bible or elsewhere, has done so. From all human experience Liberalism cannot cite one such case. It cannot even cite Jesus, for there is no historic data that the Jesus of Liberalism ever lived. John did not know him. The Christ of John is the sinless One who died for sinners,—not as an example but as a propitiation. The Christ of John is the *object* of faith,—not an example of how men should have faith in God. Jesus never said, "Believe in God as I believe in him"; he did say, "Ye believe in God, believe also in me." John 14:1. Instead of saying that men should believe in God as he believed in God, Jesus said that men should believe in *him* as they believed in God.

This distinction between the Gospels and Unitarianism is so vital that we may dwell upon it for a moment. The point is that Jesus presented himself as the one whom men should trust as

Savior and Lord. John makes that as plain as a-b-c. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." John 3:36. Never mind whether these are the words of Jesus or his Apostle, there they are! They affirm that "he that believeth on the Son," not believeth in God like the Son; "hath," not shall have, "eternal life,"—a phrase found seventeen times in John. John never, either in his Gospel or Epistles, applies eternal to anything but "life."

Clearly, Jesus is speaking in 11:25: "I am the resurrection and the life." He shows how he is the Resurrection; he who believes in me, even if he had died (physically) shall live eternally. He shows how he is the Life; every one who is living and is a believer in me shall never die (eternally). In either instance, or both, he presents himself as the object of faith. Is he a credible and worthy object? The context answers that inquiry satisfactorily.

The setting is the death of Lazarus. The raising of the dead is different from other miracles. Each miracle required divine power, but the evidence of that power's operation is clearest in cases where the dead were raised. We may not draw sharp lines between sickness and health, nor deny that storms and calms alternate; but there is no resemblance in nature to the raising of the dead,—that is one thing nature has never

done. Jesus did it three times. John has preserved at length the most notable case,—the raising of a man four days dead and in a state of decomposition. The Christ who performed that miracle is indeed the Resurrection and the Life, worthy of all trust and sufficient for every emergency. When he bids us believe in him as we believe in God our intellects incline us and our hearts prompt us to obey.

Jesus was perfectly sure of the reality of a life after death and that he was the source of that life. How vastly different from the noblest teacher, the profoundest philosopher, of classic Greece! Socrates made his way out of the fog and confusion of polytheism into the sunlight and order of monotheism. He did not, however, arrive at a conviction of certainty about immortality. The day he drank the hemlock, he talked long and interestingly with Hermogenes, Apollodorus, Critobulus, Æschines, Ctesippus, Menexenus, Epigines, Antisthenes, and others about immortality. He said: "To affirm confidently that these things are as I have narrated, is not proper for a man that has judgment (sense); that, however, this is true, or something like this, with regard to our souls and their dwelling places, if (since) the soul appears to be immortal, it seems to me, who thinks that this is so, proper and worth while to make this adventure, for the adventure is excellent (noble)." (Plato's Phædo, lxiii, first

lines.) This is the highest point to which philosophy climbed before Christ.

Turn to the fourteenth of John and read the words of Jesus to his disciples. They were spoken under circumstances similar to those in which Socrates uttered the words just quoted. Ah, but what a difference! Christ is certain where Socrates was, at most, hopeful; "In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am there ye may be also." Christ did not declare his teaching to be the Way of Life, as a recent Modernist author alleges. He declared *himself* to be that way: "I am the way, the truth, and the life." Blessed words of the Master! They have strengthened the weak, guided the perplexed, comforted the sorrowing and saved the lost, through past centuries. They are the satisfaction and stay of millions of reverent hearts this very hour. Jesus is the way by which we go, the truth by which we know, the life by which we live. O man, walk that way to glory, know that ultimate truth, receive that life everlasting! They are to be had by accepting Christ. "As many as received him, to them gave he authority to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name," 1:12. Reader, you were born with a capacity for becoming a son

of God. Christ is from all eternity the Son of God. You are empowered to become a son of God, you have the right, the authority, of a son of God the moment you voluntarily accept Christ. Would you know and feel the preciousness and power of this? Then test it and you shall. "If any man will do his will he shall know of the doctrine," 7:17.

V

ACCORDING TO PAUL

Paul was the ablest Christian of the New Testament. To his strong native intellect was added the best education of the times. The fields of poetry, philology, philosophy and religion were familiar to him. An ardent nature impelled him to do whole-heartedly whatever he undertook. Sincerity was one of his resplendent virtues. Able, ardent, and sincere, he was Christianity's greatest trophy in the first century, probably in nineteen centuries. He was the clearest interpreter of Jesus Christ, the profoundest advocate of the doctrine of salvation.

The largest contributor to the New Testament Canon, directly and indirectly, is Paul. Most of the Acts, by Luke, is devoted to him, and he is the author of at least thirteen epistles. Among the earliest Christian documents extant are some of Paul's letters. Harnock dates Thessalonians, his first epistles, 48-49, and Ramsay dates these two books 51-52, and it may be that Galatians antedates these.

Saul of Tarsus was the arch enemy of Christianity. Stephen had been stoned with his approval, probably by his vote. Like a wolf in a flock he had scattered the first church. His fiery

zeal knew no bounds. He would pursue the Christians, both men and women, to Damascus and arrest and bind and bring them to Jerusalem. Here was no doubting skeptic like Thomas; rather was he a violent hater, a determined destroyer. His hostility was hot, but honest. He thought he was doing God's service in stamping out the heresy of the Nazarene.

The most sudden and surprising event in the New Testament happened to Saul on the Damascus road. That event is of such importance that it is related four times: by Luke, Acts 9; by Paul to the Jews, Acts 22; by Paul to Agrippa, Acts 26; and by Paul to the Galatians, 1-2. There are slight variations, such as a reasonable reader would expect, but the essential facts are substantiated. A light shone upon him, a voice spoke unto him, he inquired who it was, he was informed that it was Jesus, and trembling and astonished he said: "Lord, what shall I do?" That moment Saul's career of persecution ended, and his life of obedience to Jesus began. A radical change, a violent revulsion, occurred in Saul's whole nature. This is beyond dispute.

It must of necessity be, that the person attesting this experience of himself, and of whom it is related by another authentic historian, was either deceived, or was a deceiver, or what he declared to have been the cause of his conversion and to have happened in consequence of it, *did really happen.*

As to his being deceived; Who was there to deceive him? It was morally impossible for the disciples to conceive the idea and devise the plan of turning, by fraud, this persecutor into an apostle at the period of his fiercest fury against the Lord. But, could they have been so extravagant as to conceive such a thought, it was physically impossible for them to execute it, in the manner in which the conversion is described. How could those fleeing disciples produce a light which at midday was brighter than that of the sun? How could they make Saul hear and understand words which others of the company heard but did not understand? How could they make him blind for three days and then make scales fall from his eyes? Why, the disciples were astonished at Saul's change. They not only did not fraudulently contrive to bring it about, they were astonished when it transpired and Ananias and other Christians were reluctant to believe its truthfulness. The situation was similar to that one after the resurrection of Jesus—the disciples were neither looking for it, nor quick to believe it as a fact. Beyond controversy, no fraud was, or could have been, practiced on Saul that momentous day on the road. Much less still, could the deceit of others produce those results subsequent to that experience, results beneficent and bountiful, sacrificial and sustained.

As to being a deceiver; What was his motive? There could have been no rational motive to un-

dertake an imposture, nor could it have possibly succeeded by the means we know he employed. What was the inducement to Saul to palm off an imposture? Surely not the hope of advancing himself. The revelation through Ananias declared how great things he should suffer. Reflect upon what it cost Saul to be a Christian and the motive of self-interest is eliminated as a possibility. He forfeited his fortune, lost his reputation, incurred the enmity of his friends, risked family alienation and abandoned his religion, all for Christ. He then began a life of poverty and peril, homelessness and hazard, danger and death, and he shrank not even to the bloody end.

The state of Christianity when Saul espoused it, disproves the hypothesis that he was an imposter seeking fame and fortune. He left the disposers of wealth, dignity, office, and power; he allied himself with the indigent, the hated and the oppressed. He embraced a sect whose leader had been condemned as a criminal and died on a cross between two thieves; whose doctrines were repudiated by the wisest of the Greeks and the highest of the Jews; and whose members were under common contempt. With them he was made "as the filth of the world, the off-scouring of all things," I Cor. 4:12.

His behavior ever afterwards also disproves deception. He tells the Corinthians: "Even unto this present hour we both hunger and thirst; and are naked, and are buffetted, and have no certain

dwelling-place, and labor, working with our own hands," I Cor. 4:11. To the Thessalonians he says: "For ye remember, brethren, our labor and travail: for laboring night and day, because we would not be chargeable unto any of you, we preached unto you the Gospel of God," I Thess. 2:9. In his farewell address to the Ephesian elders he says: "I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel. Yea, you yourselves know, that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me," Acts 20:33 f. Such insinuations of deception and insincerity are not new. They were made by his enemies then, and the passages quoted are just samples of whole chapters in which Paul indignantly brands them as false. The disinterested devotion of Paul to Christ is so luminous that even the blind can see it.

The conclusion is fairly and undeniably drawn, that what is related to have been the cause of Paul's conversion and to have happened in consequence of it, did actually happen. I have dwelt upon this event because it is the most stupendous since the resurrection of Christ. In fact, the conversion of Saul proves the resurrection and confirms the Christian religion as a divine revelation. Lord Lyttleton and Gilbert West, Esq., both men of acknowledged talents, but with a superficial knowledge and skeptical view of the Scriptures, met and determined to expose Christianity as a cheat. Lord Lyttleton chose the Conversion of

Paul, and Mr. West the Resurrection of Christ for the subjects of hostile criticism. Both began their respective tasks full of prejudice; but the result of their efforts to overthrow Christianity was their conversion. After their investigation, they came together, "not as they expected, to exult over an imposture exposed to ridicule, but to lament over their own folly and to felicitate each other on their joint conviction that the Bible was the Word of God." Lord Lyttleton says in his able treatise: "I thought the conversion and the apostleship of Paul alone, duly considered, was of itself a demonstration sufficient to prove Christianity to be a divine revelation."

Paul had clear and decided views of Jesus. All his works and words are upon the pre-supposition that Jesus was more than man. He states facts which cannot be explained except upon the hypothesis of unique sonship. He interprets his personal experience of Jesus. According to Sabatier, this is the most satisfactory test of truth; that which appeals to one's own consciousness. Paul may never have seen Jesus in the flesh. Nevertheless, he saw him. They met face to face on the Damascus road: "He was seen of me also," I Cor. 15:8. That was certainly not more than seven years after the crucifixion. Several times afterwards Jesus appeared to Paul. All the time afterward Jesus was a living reality to Paul.

We are to examine the data in Acts and the

Pauline Epistles with the purpose of ascertaining Paul's view of the supernatural nature of Christ. It is alleged by certain critics that the gospel of Christ was changed by Paul and that original Christianity was corrupted by Paulinism. On the contrary, it can be shown that the Christ of the Evangelists was the Christ of Paul and that Christ was the source of Paul's religion of redemption. Let us see for ourselves whether Paul believed Christ to be supernatural or not.

The Pre-incarnate One. Paul and John are one in their doctrine of the eternal existence of Christ. The prologue of John 1:1-14 and Phil. 2:5-8 and Col. 1:15-19 can be placed in parallel columns as agreeable accounts of the same divine mystery. Paul's passages plainly declare the eternal sonship and pre-incarnate glory of Christ. The mysterious statement is made in Philippians (2:6) that Christ being in the *morphe* of God did not look upon his equality with God as an act of usurpation. Christ referred to that state when he spoke of the glory he had with the Father before the world was. (John 17:8.) The magnificently dogmatic passage in Colossians on the exaltation of Christ states that he existed before any created thing. Often has the sorrow-riven heart been comforted with those words in the funeral service: "The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven," I Cor. 15:47. The Christ of Paul did not become divine when he was born of a woman, or when

the Spirit descended upon him at his baptism, but was divine, equal with God, before creation.

The Man Among Men. The eternal Son voluntarily "emptied himself"—stripped himself of the insignia of majesty, of the habiliments of deity,—and took upon him the nature of a bond-servant by becoming a man like other men. The Docetics denied the humanity of Jesus. Paul says he was truly human (Phil. 2:7 f.), had a human body (Col. 1:21), was born of a woman, born subject to Law (Gal. 4:4), was, as regards his human descent, of the posterity of David (Rom. 1:3). Paul insists that Christ was truly man.

The Cerenthians denied the deity of Jesus. Paul says he was truly divine; for it is in Christ that the fullness of God's nature dwells in a bodily manifestation (Col. 2:9). The Eternal Word did not empty himself of his divine nature or attributes, but only of the outward form or manifestation of the Godhead. Jesus was not the end of a series of eons, but was "the first born of all creation" (Col. 1:3). Paul recognizes no distinction between the human Jesus and the divine Christ. He uses the words interchangeably. They designated one and the same person, "Christ Jesus the Lord," Col. 2:6.

The Son of God. Immediately after his conversion Paul began to preach. His first sermon was on the theme, Jesus, the Son of God. "And straightway he preached Christ in the synagogue,

that he is the Son of God," Acts 9:20. Peter gave especial prominence to the Messiahship: "God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ," Acts 2:36. Paul, fresh from the vision on the highway, emphasized Deity. Peter charged the Jews with crucifying the Son of God, their Messiah, Acts 2:25-30. Paul charged them with having crucified the Lord of Glory, I Cor. 2:8. His point was that Jesus, the crucified Nazarene, was the Christ and therefore God the Son. This was his first testimony as a Christian. When he returned to Damascus after three years' meditation in Arabia he "gained more and more influence and as for the Jews living in Damascus, he bewildered them with proofs that Jesus is the Christ," Acts 9:22 (Weymouth).

Until death, Paul was the consistent and uncompromising bondservant of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. To the Romans he wrote that the promise of good news through the Prophets was "concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord," Rom. 1:3. He viewed this personality as dual; as to his humanity, he was of the seed of David; as to his deity, he was decisively proved to be "the Son of God by the resurrection from the dead," Rom. 1:3 f. The Liberals cite "of the seed of David" in an attempt to disprove the deity of Jesus and the virgin birth, and claim it necessarily refers to Davidic ancestry and to generation by Joseph. However, the Liberals are

more critical than correct. The descent of Jesus was from David through Mary. Had these critics been more careful and less captious they might have found the same word for seed, *spermatos,* used of a woman, Rev. 12:17.

The Pre-incarnate One, and the Man among Men, was therefore one person,—the Son of God. He was not two personalities, two wills, two minds, two beings; he was not God in man, or God and man, but the God-man. "He was the only true incarnation of God,—God in a human body, and with a human soul; and yet there are no absurdities" (Pierson). The centaur, the faun and the mermaid, fabled inventions of duality, are grotesque absurdities. But Christ was an absolutely new being, harmonious, symmetrical, consistent. Paul knew him as the union of the divine and human in one person, the same person whose honest portrait is seen in the Evangelists, and Paul, as do they, treats this marvelous person as a reality without attempting to explain the profound mystery. He admitted the mystery but accepted the fact: "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifested in the flesh," I Tim. 3:16. If the pronoun, who, be the correct reading, the mystery and the contrast compel the reference to Deity. The manifestation of a man in the flesh would be no mystery. To speak of the manifestation of a man in the flesh would be foolish. The Incarnation is the vital truth of which the Church of the living

God is the pillar and support. Liberals reject it because they cannot understand the mystery. To be consistent, they should never eat another meal, for they cannot understand how some food goes to blood, some to tissue, some to bone and some to fat. Yet they keep on eating. They cannot explain how the same grass makes wool on sheep and feathers on geese. There are a hundred mysteries in every-day life which we accept and act upon, but cannot understand and do not attempt to explain. We accept and live by them.

It is sometimes affirmed that Paul never called Jesus God. Let us see if he did not. To the elders he used this phrase: "The church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood," Acts 20:28. The pronoun "his" has no antecedent but God. To the Romans, in setting forth the sevenfold privilege of Israel, he puts Christ at the climax in language which calls him God: "Of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever," Rom. 9:5. To Titus, in outlining the pastoral work of a true minister, he cites an incentive: "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ," Titus 2:13. The article is not repeated and the grammar naturally means that God and Savior Jesus Christ are one and the same. Furthermore, the context is in harmony with this interpretation. The Christians were not looking for the appearing of God the Father. They were looking for the ap-

pearing of God the Son. This was their happy hope. One must have strong predilections against the doctrine who does not see in these passages that Paul does call Jesus God.

The Omnipotent One. Omnipotence is an attribute of God. Paul ascribes it to Jesus. He is the creator and sustainer of all things in earth and heaven, seen and unseen, thrones, dominions, princedoms, powers, Col. 1:16. They were created *in* Christ, *by* him and *for* him. In him; no creative process was external and independent of him—all sources reside in him. By him; he was the power which called the worlds out of chaos into cosmos and holds them in orderly array. For him; he is the end as well as the source of all things and "in living for him every creature finds at once the explanation and the law of its being."

The Lord Jesus Christ not only created, he has power to re-create, to make the dead live. "We are awaiting with longing expectation for the coming from heaven of a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who, in the exercise of the power which he has even to subject all things to himself, will transform the body of our humiliation until it resembles his own glorious body," Phil. 3:21 f (Weymouth). That is mightier than raising a twelve-year-old girl just dead, or a young man being buried, or a man already decaying in the grave. It is the direct exercise of a power which none but God possesses.

The Christ of Paul was all-powerful over death. Over his own death; "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept," I Cor. 15:20. Over the death of his people: "Even so in Christ shall all be made alive," vs. 22. Christ shall consummate his work by destroying the last enemy, death: "He must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet," vs. 25. One may deny that Christ has this power; he may deny that there is any such coming event as his return; but no intelligent student can deny that Paul taught that Christ had triumphed over death and would return in triumph and raise and reward his disciples. Even now we can hear Paul's pean of victory: "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ," I Cor. 15:55-57.

The Lord of Life. The Christ of Paul was something more than a beautiful memory. He was a living Personality. He was alive in Paul. He had completely mastered Paul; "But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law,

but that which is through faith in Christ, (objective genitive) in righteousness which is of (ek) God by faith," Phil. 3:7-9.

Paul was consumed with a passion for Christ. Forgetting the impeding past and looking unto the inviting, challenging future, he "pressed toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus," vs. 14. He actually longed to share Christ's sufferings and die even as he died, vs. 10.

Christ dominated the thought and acts of Paul. What the living witnesses told him of the Lord, what the Lord revealed to him directly, and what truth about the Lord the Holy Spirit guided him into, he received reverently, expounded lucidly and obeyed loyally. He delved more deeply into the mysteries of grace and gave clearer outline of the mysteries of the future than any other. Christ was the fountain of that grace and the key to that future. The historical Christ was a settled fact of the past, the risen Christ was a living reality in the present, and the returning Christ was a blessed hope of the future, in the thinking and living of Paul.

The first question he asked Jesus was an index to Paul. He wanted first to know from Jesus what he should do. That ascertained, questioning was at an end. He was not "disobedient to the heavenly vision." He followed the gleam wherever it led—across mountains, straits, seas, and continents. Stoning, imprisonment, beating, ship-

wreck, death, were mere incidents in the transcendent event of a life wholly devoted to the Lord. The faithful execution of the commission received from Jesus, the Lord of Life, was the reason why he suffered so severely, but he was not ashamed, II Tim. 1:11 f. The trend of thought and the course of his life, from the day on which he saw the light until the day when his head fell from the block, were dominated by Christ.

Never was man, in mind and body, so absolutely and cheerfully subject to another personality as was Paul to Christ. He came nearer to that oneness with the purpose and will of Christ which Christ had with the Father than any one who has ever thought Christ's thoughts after him. Jesus said he himself did "always those things that pleased the Father," John 8:29; Paul's ambition and constant effort were to please Christ (II Cor. 5:9, Gal. 1:10). Jesus illustrated in his own person the principle he announced (Luke 14:26) that natural affection as compared to devotion to divine duty was as hate compared with love, Matt. 12:47-50; Paul exemplified the truth that attachment to Christ transcended every earthly tie and devotion to Christ preceded every worldly claim, Phil. 3:7-9. Jesus, facing a cruel death, exclaimed: "I have overcome the world," John 16:33; Paul, facing the executioner's ax, exclaimed: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith," II Tim. 4:7. If Jesus were not God, Paul was indeed

mad. Paul said his course of opposition to Christ was madness, (Acts 26:11), but his subsequent zeal for Christ was soberness and truth (Acts 26:25). Unitarianism leaves Paul an insoluble riddle.

In vain do the Unitarians attempt to show that the Christians' conception of the Lordship of Christ was taken from surrounding paganism. The term "Lord" was common in the Hellenistic age as a title of divinity, no whit inferior to the term God, and was applied to Emperors and others. Paul was familiar with all this, more so than the Modernists. He was a sturdy monotheist, yet to him Christ was Lord, but not of the type of the cult-gods. He specifically states the Lordship of Christ in a passage of striking comparison: "For, supposing there are so-called gods in heaven or on earth,—and indeed there are plenty such gods and lords,—yet, for us there is just one God, the Father, who is the source of all things, and for whom we live, and just one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom everything was made and through whom we live," I Cor. 8:5, 6 (Goodspeed).

The Divine Redeemer. The mission of Jesus was not primarily to *say,* but to *do.* The essential thing about him is that he is a Redeemer. This is not a conjecture. He should have known better than any other the nature of his mission. He defined it to Zaccheus: "For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost,"

Luke 19:10. There is no need to quibble about "Son of man." That expression occurs eighty-four times in the Gospels. While the phrase expressed Christ's sense of brotherhood with men it is also used to designate prerogatives belonging exclusively to God (Mark 2:10), being always an official designation. The properties of the human and divine were indissolubly knit together in a single person (Alexandrian Fathers).

The mission of Jesus Christ, then, was to seek and to save. But how was he to save? He answers that question explicitly: "For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many," Mark 10:45. The word "ransom" is repulsive to certain modern minds. All the worse for them. When employed by Jesus it carried a very definite idea. It meant money paid for the return of a lost possession, or atonement money paid by a Jew to avert the just judgments of God upon his sin, or the price of redemption of a man from captivity or slavery, or the price paid to save a man from death. Jesus declared that the purpose for which he came was to serve men while he lived and to give his life as a ransom. The Gospels bulk the death of Christ as the most important fact in his life. Only two Evangelists tell of the virgin birth, only two record the sermon on the mount, but all four detail the death of Christ, each of them giving more than a fourth of his space to the Passion Week. The risen Christ

caused the Apostles to understand the Scripture prediction that he must suffer and die (Luke 24:46 f). The first sermon preached after the death of Christ on the cross declared that his death was according to God's settled purpose and foreknowledge (Acts 2:23).

Now, what conception did Paul have of the necessity and nature of Christ's death? Precisely that of the four Evangelists and of the early Acts. The cross was central in Paul's theology. He gloried in the cross (Gal. 6:14). He determined to be utterly ignorant, when among the Corinthians, of everything except Jesus Christ, and of him as *having been crucified* (I Cor. 2:2). Even the radical Bousset admits that Paul's religion was based upon the death of Christ. Where did Paul get his idea of such a Christ? The Radicals answer, "From the common conceptions current in his day—the dying gods." But Paul's conception was vastly different from these. Osiris, Adonis, and Attis were the victims of fate; Jesus' death was voluntary and according to God's eternal and Christ's oft repeated purpose. The death of Christ was utterly unlike the heathen cults and the preaching of the cross was "to the Gentiles foolishness," I Cor. 1:23. If Paul borrowed from the Gentiles how was it that they could not understand his Christ crucified?

Obviously and unmistakably, Paul got his idea of the necessity and nature of the death of Christ

from the disciples and from Christ himself. It was a fact of history and also a personal revelation and experience. "He loved me and gave himself for me," (Gal. 2:20) was Paul's statement. "For I repeated to you the all-important fact which also I had been taught, that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the Scriptures," I Cor. 15:3 (Weymouth). Paul does not state *by* whom he was taught this doctrine, but he had intercourse with the disciples (Acts 9:19) and there was opportunity for the instruction. His view was precisely that of the Gospels and early chapters of Acts.

One illustration will suffice—the Lord's Supper. Matthew, Mark, Luke and Paul all have accounts of the initiation of this sacred rite. There are slight variations as always occur in independent and truthful witnesses. However, all four agree upon the vital fact, viz: that it was for others. According to Mark, his blood is "shed for many"; according to Luke "it is shed for you"; according to Matthew it is "for many for the remission of sins." Luke and Paul both record Jesus as saying his body was broken for others. "This is my body which is given for you," Luke 22:19; "This is my body which is broken for you," I Cor. 11:24. The four men agree that Christ's death was in a peculiar sense for others. That fact cannot be read out of the records or explained away. By a perpetual and

impressive memorial that solemn and substantial fact is kept continually before the eyes and upon the consciousness of his people.

A young man was being examined with a view to his ordination to the gospel ministry. He had answered the question about the death of Christ satisfactorily to the examiner, viz.: that it was voluntary and vicarious, propitiary and substitutionary. A Liberal on the Presbytery interjected: "Christ died for the truth he taught. Buddha died for the truth he taught. There was no essential difference, was there?" "Yes, there was a vital difference in the manner and meaning of their death," replied the young minister. "Christ died on the cross as a voluntary sin offering. Buddha ate a big dinner and lay down under a tree and died of indigestion." I have not verified the statement as to Buddha's death, but the Liberal did not dispute it and the Liberals are, confessedly, very learned.

Paul powerfully portrayed the crucifixion. It was so vividly placarded in Galatia that it was as if Christ had been crucified right before their eyes (3:1). Sophistry had bewitched them to turn away from the cross as the way of salvation. Paul calls them back to the cross. That was the only way of salvation. A man is not justified by works of the law but by faith in Jesus Christ (Gal. 2:16). Men are not the sons of God by nature but by faith in Jesus Christ (Gal. 3:26). Paul demonstrated in two masterly epistles, Romans and Ga-

latians, that salvation is universally available, by faith in Jesus Christ, and in no other way.

The Unitarians teach salvation by character. Not one of them is the peer of Paul in character; not one of them is as blameless touching the law; not one of them is more sincere or so ardent for righteousness. Nevertheless, Paul despaired of salvation by character. He would not trust in the flesh, in physical advantages or in good deeds. No flesh was justified by the deeds of the law. Justification was not by works of righteousness. There was none righteous save Christ. Righteousness and life were through saving faith in him. He came, not to teach men how to live, but to give them a new life through death. Character was the fruit, not the root, of salvation. A good life was the result of salvation, not the procuring cause. "For when we were still helpless, at the decisive moment Christ died for us godless men. Why, a man will hardly give his life for an upright person, though perhaps for a really good man some may be brave enough to die. But God proves his love for us by the fact that Christ died for us when we were still sinners. So, if we have already been made upright by his death, it is far more certain that through him we shall be saved from God's anger! If, when we were God's enemies, we were reconciled to him through the death of his Son, it is far more certain that now that we are reconciled we shall be saved through sharing his life! More than that, we actually glory in

God through our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom we owe our reconciliation," Rom. 5:6-11. (Goodspeed.)

This, in brief, is Paul's plan of salvation. It is in exact harmony with the teachings of Christ in the Synoptic Gospels, as we have seen, and also in John, e.g., his conversation with Nicodemus. It has been the refuge of saints in ages past, is their comfort in the present, and their hope for the future.

"When the woes of life o'ertake me,
Hopes deceive, and fears annoy,
Never shall the cross forsake me;
Lo! it glows with peace and joy.

"When the sun of bliss is beaming
Light and love upon my way,
From the cross the radiance streaming,
Adds new luster to the day."

The Supreme Judge. Christ taught three things about the judgment.

1. The fact. He looked forward to one great day; a final judgment by which men are separated and assigned their respective destinies. The parables of the Tares and Dragnet and the twenty-fifth of Matthew all describe the judgment.

2. The judge. He is the judge. "Across the dim and conflicting images evoked by his other teaching about the future one point shines with

a steady and unchangeable light," that he is judge (Stalker). "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son," John 5:22.

3. The issue. The final fate of men is determined by their relation to Christ. "In as much as ye did it to the least of these my brethren, ye did it unto me," Matt. 25:40. "I will profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity," Matt. 7:23. His discernment detects the vital issue with unerring precision and by that issue the everlasting state is decided.

Paul taught the same things as did Christ. It is amazing that men should say Paul founded a second Christianity with doctrines radically different from those of Christ. Far from Paul subverting Christianity by turning it into another channel, he deepened and broadened the channel through which original Christianity flowed. Every comparison of Paul's Christ with the Christ of the Evangelists clarifies this stream of truth. Consider the comparison as to the judgment.

1. The fact. The great event of the future in the mind of Paul was the judgment. "God hath appointed a day," Acts 17:31. "We must all appear," Rom. 14:10. "I charge thee, therefore," II Tim. 4:1. By the certainty of that coming event he warned skeptical Gentiles, stressed individual responsibility of believers, and enjoined faithfulness upon preachers.

2. The judge. God is the Creator, Supreme Ruler, and Judge of the universe. Paul was firmly grounded in those fundamentals of Monotheism. Yet he says that Jesus is the judge. It is "Christ's judgment seat," II Cor. 5:10. He is the appointed judge (Acts 17:31), just as on earth Christ said the judgeship had been committed to him. The correct text in Rom. 14:10 is *Theou* and not *Christou,* but that does not weaken the position taken in this discussion. See Sanday on this point: "God is here mentioned as Judge because He judged the world through Christ. . . . The Father and the Son were in his mind so united in function that They may often be interchanged. God, or Christ, or God through Christ, will judge the world. Our life is in God, or in Christ, or with Christ in God. The union of man with God depends upon the intimate union of the Father and the Son."

3. The issue. The verdict of acquittal or condemnation was according as one is related to Jesus Christ. "There is therefore now no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus," Rom. 8:1. There is no condemnation from the law, whose demands Christ met, or from inherent sinfulness, of which Christ was absolutely free; no condemnation from any source for any cause possible forever for those in Christ Jesus.

At the close of his life of apostleship, Paul joyfully anticipated the coming judgment, the person of the judge and the personal issue: "Henceforth

there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing," II Tim. 4:8. "That day," so marked a feature in the teaching of Jesus that he came to refer to it without considering it necessary to specify, had become identical to Paul who had passed from condemnation to acquittal by faith in the crucified, risen, reigning, and returning Christ, and who was happy in the expectation of receiving his crown. "That day" is bright and full of hope and blessedness to all who now trust and love the Lord and look for his appearing. It is dark and full of dread to all who doubt, disbelieve, or oppose.

"When thou, my righteous Judge, shalt come
To take thy ransomed people home,
Shall I among them stand?

"Shall such a worthless worm as I,
Who sometimes am afraid to die,
Be found at thy right hand?"

VI

THE VIRGIN BIRTH

The virgin birth of Jesus is found in all the great creeds of evangelical and Catholic Christianity. It is a cardinal tenet. Whoever assents to these creeds accepts this doctrine. Evidently, not all who recite the creed with their lips believe it with their hearts. Recent issues of the *New York Times* devote columns to the dissenting views of men who are logically and honorably bound by the Apostles' Creed and yet who repudiate or question the virgin birth.

I do not subscribe to any creed. My sole authority for faith is the New Testament. To every doctrine contained in that book I subscribe. To as much of a creed as conforms to New Testament teaching I would give my assent; not because it is in the creed but because it is in the New Testament. Creeds are the productions of uninspired men who endeavor to summarize and state Bible doctrine. Being human and uninspired they are fallible.

I believe in the virgin birth as an article of faith founded upon good reasons. One of these reasons is the documentary *evidence.* There are four biographies of Jesus. The one by Mark does not profess to relate the early life of Jesus. It be-

gins with his public ministry, but it begins by affirming that he was "the Son of God." The one by John begins with the eternal preëxistence and deity of Jesus and declares that he "was made flesh and dwelt among us." The one by Matthew narrates the events of Jesus' birth from the viewpoint of Joseph. Joseph was in grave perplexity over Mary's condition. He was a prudent and chivalrous man who was unwilling to put his betrothed to public shame. He purposed to shield her and protect himself by giving Mary a private letter of divorce with two subscribing witnesses. God came to the rescue. He informed Joseph that Mary's condition was of the Holy Spirit; that she should bring forth a son who should save his people from their sins; and the biographer adds that this was in fulfillment of the prophecy of the Lord: "Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel." He used the Greek, *parthenos,* which is the word in the Septuagint. That translation of the Hebrew Old Testament into Greek was completed by 150 A.D. Those learned translators used the word which conveyed their idea of the meaning of the prophecy.

The biography by Luke narrates the events of Jesus' birth from the side of Mary. It tells of the annunciation to the virgin Mary in explicit terms: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow

thee: wherefore also that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God. For with God nothing shall be impossible." The full account by Matthew is in chapter 1:18-25; the full account by Luke is in chapter 1:26-38; any one can examine the accounts for himself. They both employ the word *parthenos* which means: "Virgin even if married. Here unmarried but betrothed." (Robertson.)

Analyzing the evidence we have: 1. Only two of the four Gospels mention the birth of Jesus and each of them records that he entered the world by miraculous means. Both of them state that Mary was the mother and the Holy Spirit the father. The two records are independent, complementary and convincing. One of them, Matthew, takes pains to show that the virgin birth was in accord with the Old Testament of which he is an expert interpreter. The one by Luke is the account of a physician who had "traced the course of all things accurately from the first" and the historicity of whose writing is established. The first thing in Luke, after his painstaking introduction, is the nativity narrative. There stand two credible witnesses testifying to this great doctrine. There is not a witness in the New Testament who contradicts them.

2. The Gospel by Mark does not deal with the early years of Jesus. It is as fallacious to say that Jesus did not have a boyhood because Mark does not mention it as it is to say he did not have

a virgin birth because Mark does not mention it. It is significant, however, that the first verse of Mark's Gospel is entirely consistent with the birth accounts of Matthew and Luke, and that throughout his Gospel which records the mighty deeds of Jesus his supernatural character is recognized.

3. The Gospel by John opens with an account of Jesus before the creation of the world. He was with God in the beginning and was God. John then says this eternal Christ was incarnated, became man. He skips from the pre-incarnation to the public ministry of the Baptist. We hear him first tell of Jesus existing in eternity. We next hear him telling of Jesus dwelling among men in the glory of the only begotten of the Father. Here we have a biographer who tells us that Jesus was God in eternity and that he was God in time; that the preëxistent one was made flesh. John does not describe the process of that transition from eternity to time. Are we, therefore, to conclude that there was no virgin birth? By no means. On the contrary, John's first chapter necessitates a virgin birth. John says that Jesus' divine life was continuous before and after his incarnation, that he was "God only begotten." The facts stated by John plead the virgin birth. Those facts fit the faith, they harmonize with the doctrine of the virgin birth. In the supernatural person of Christ the virgin birth was natural. There is no other way to explain

how he became man without impairing his deity.

To sum up the evidence; there are four biographies of Jesus. Two of them record his miraculous birth in language which cannot be explained away. The other two record nothing of the earthly life of Jesus until he begins his public ministry, but their first mention of him is of such a nature as to harmonize with the two birth accounts and even to demand them as an explanation of this supernatural character. The logician and philosopher, Prof. Noah K. Davis, used to sum up the evidence in this case before the students of the University of Virginia by presenting inescapable alternatives: "Whoever rejects the supernatural features of this story, and, while admitting it to have an historical basis, insists on natural order, thus denying the virginity of the mother of Jesus, must fall in with the views of the gossips of Nazareth and hold either that Joseph was a vile seducer and Jesus begotten out of wedlock, a legitimized bastard; or that Mary was a harlot, legally amenable to stoning, who by extravagant lies imposed upon the pious simplicity of her fascinated betrothed, and that Jesus the fruit of this wickedness, was a bastard of unacknowledged paternity." Such an one is not "my Lord and my God."

Another reason for belief in the virgin birth is the *logic of the situation.* If the birth of Jesus was natural, who was his father? Not Joseph, for he disclaimed the paternity of Mary's concep-

tion. The dilemma is that Jesus was begotten of the Holy Spirit, or he was conceived out of wedlock and outside betrothal. One shudders at the suggestion. The orthodox view is the more reasonable, the more ethical, the more comforting. In the light of Mary's exemplary life and Jesus' peerless character the virgin birth is the more *plausible* view.

If Jesus was God in human form, miraculous circumstances must have accompanied his assumption of that human form. Instead of the virgin birth being an incongruous portent, it is dissociable in thought from the Incarnation. Instead of being a barrier to faith, it is the intelligible explanation of how deity became flesh.

The case of Jesus is unlike that of ourselves. We begin life at the moment of our human generation. He did not begin when he was born; his own consciousness was of a prior existence. Listen to the words of Jesus. To the inquiring and doubting Nicodemus he said: "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven," John 3:13. Of his offended followers at a crisis in his ministry he inquired: "What if ye behold the Son of man ascending where he was before?" John. 6:62. Near the close he prayed to God the Father: "O Father, glorify thou me, with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was," Jno. 17:5. To the cavilling Jews he said: "Ye are from beneath:

I am from above: ye are of this world: I am not of this world," Jno. 8:23. It is not remarkable that the birth of such an one should have been unique. We should expect it to be unusual, exceptional, miraculous. "In a person so supernatural the virgin birth was natural." I cannot conceive of another method by which Jesus might have made his advent.

Jesus is unlike ourselves in that he never calls Joseph, or any other man, his father. We have fathers in the flesh of whom and to whom we speak; not so with Jesus. Whenever he speaks of his Father he refers to God. This is so plain in the Gospels that I suppose no one will deny it. It is tremendously significant.

Another reason for belief in the virgin birth is the *presupposition of Paul.* It is insisted by certain liberals that Paul has perverted the original gospel and by certain other liberals that there was no miraculous birth of Jesus because Paul never refers to it. When Paulinism is contrary to their theory they reject it as an accretion or corruption; when they think they can use Paul in favor of their predilections they cite him as an authority. Such is the inconsistency of men! Does the silence of Paul disprove the virgin birth of Jesus?

The knowledge Paul possessed of Jesus is an intensely interesting question. Before his conversion he knew more about the life of Jesus than is generally conceded. What happened to him

on the Damascus road was not so much a communication of new facts as a new interpretation of these facts. Jesus Christ appeared to Paul in mercy to call him to salvation and service, to grant him forgiveness and to commission him as an apostle. In the exercise of that apostleship Paul only four times cites the words of Jesus: (1) In I Cor. 7:10, he appeals to a command of Jesus about divorce; (2) in I Cor. 9:14 he calls attention to an ordinance of Jesus providing support for preachers; (3) in I Thess. 4:15 he quotes Jesus to show that those who are alive at the Parousia shall not go before those that have died in the Lord; and (4) in I Cor. 11:23 he repeats the words Jesus spoke in instituting the Lord's Supper. Are we to infer that the Sermon on the Mount was never delivered because Paul never mentions it? Most assuredly not. The argument from silence is not convincing. It proves too much in this instance.

The Jesus of the Gospels is the Jesus of Paul —no mere prophet, no mere interpreter of God— but the long looked for Messiah; no mere ethical teacher, no mere moral exemplar, but a supernatural person come to earth to redeem men from sin. Paul said Jesus was born of a woman; he never said he was born of man. He applies the name Jesus to the risen Lord, and the lofty title of Lord to the Jesus who was crucified.

Furthermore, Paul's Epistles do not contain his first missionary messages. They are ad-

dressed to those who had, for the most part, been converted under his ministry and to whom he had proclaimed the primary truths. These initial facts are sometimes omitted from the Epistles, therefore, not because they were unimportant but just because they were fundamental and had already been proclaimed. They would not be repeated unless challenged. Except for misunderstanding of his oral teaching about the resurrection he would not have set down in writing the testimony by which the resurrection of Jesus was established; yet he says that testimony was a vital part of his original message. Had it not been for the errorist whose misunderstanding he endeavored to correct, Modernists might have inferred that Paul did not attach importance to the doctrine of the resurrection. Likewise Paul's account of the institution of the Lord's Supper is given only because certain abuses of that ordinance had arisen in the church at Corinth. May it not be that the virgin birth was preached by Paul and never challenged and hence not explained in an Epistle?

The Pauline Epistles treat the unique personality of Christ as the Bible does the existence of God; they assume, they affirm, they do not defend. It never occurred to Paul that his doctrine of the heavenly Christ required defense. He had to defend his own apostleship, Gentile freedom, and other things; but even the Judaizers did not dis-

pute the exalted and solitary place he assigned to the person of Jesus.

The virgin birth is presupposed by Paul in several passages. Addressing the Galatians he begins: "An apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ." The Judaizers said he was not an apostle by Jesus Christ but by man. But apparently it never occurred to Paul that one might say, "By Jesus Christ and, therefore, by man." His opponents agreed with him that Jesus Christ was not ordinary humanity but truly God.

When Paul would present Christ as the believer's pattern he used terms appropriate to deity and described a course which involved the virgin birth; "Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men," Phil. 2:5-6. How could he who preëxisted in the form and with the equality of God pass from that state to the state of likeness to man so naturally, so becomingly, as by the way told in the birth stories of Matthew and Luke? Paul earnestly exhorted the Corinthians to liberality towards the poor. The most apposite illustration, the most touching appeal, he could think of was the example of Jesus. "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich," II Cor.

8:9. When was Jesus rich? Manifestly, before his incarnation. When did he become poor? Obviously when he took human form. How did he cross the gulf between heavenly riches and earthly poverty? There was but one way he could cross and that was by the Holy Spirit through a virgin. In what other way, tell us, could our rich Lord of glory enter into this world? It is noteworthy that Paul not only did not submit to the presentation of a purely human Jesus, but that he resisted the unhistorical speculations about Jesus which would reduce him to a character lower than God, or remove him from his position as the Divine Redeemer. "For by him were all things created . . . all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things and by him all things consist. . . . For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell. And having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself," Col. 1:15, 16, 19, 20. Before the incarnation he was God's instrument in creation. During the incarnation he was indwelt by the divine fullness and was the instrument in redemption by the cross. Did God withdraw all but natural forces from his entrance into the world? Did God expose him to the just and stinging shame of being born illegitimately? Did God, in this his supreme effort, merely give us another specimen of a marred type, and not the revelation of the pure and perfect type of original creation? These questions cannot be es-

caped unless we accept the virgin birth. Without that, Jesus must have partaken of sinful heredity. With that, Jesus took flesh from his mother only and is both God and man. As Canon Liddon says: "He is not less truly representative of our race because in him it has recovered its perfection."

Still another consideration in favor of the virgin birth is the *absence of a challenge of the doctrine* by any inspired speaker or writer. Nowhere in the New Testament do I find an approved apostle, prophet, evangelist, teacher, or pastor who denied, or questioned, the virgin birth of our Lord. I do find there a denial of the truth expressed in the virgin birth, the mark of false teachers: "Every Spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof we have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world," I John 4:2. I do find there frequent recognition of the mystery of the incarnation and a solemn warning against speculative philosophy: "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not according to Christ," Col. 2:8. I do find there a solemn charge to keep inviolate the deposit of faith from which some then, as now, had departed: "O Timothy, guard that which is committed to thee, turning away from profane babblings and oppositions of that which is falsely

called knowledge; which some professing erred concerning the faith," I Tim. 6:20 f.

The direct testimony of two Evangelists and the logical implications of the other two; the necessities of the case and the consciousness of eternal sonship by Jesus; the assumption by Paul and the profound passages in which he discusses deity becoming human; the absence of any challenge of the virgin birth by a New Testament writer and the anathemas against those who deny that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh; the warnings against speculation and the exhortation to hold fast and forth the faith; these, taken altogether, should reassure us that the doctrine standeth sure, and hearten us to preach it with confidence and courage.

Do you ask then: "Why is there such agitation over this long-cherished and well-supported article of faith?" The answer is four-fold.

1. There are members of evangelical churches who are practically Unitarians. Unitarianism as a distinct sect is inconsequential. As a leaven in the other sects it is to be considered. There be those in the evangelical denominations who would divest Jesus' person of its deity, eliminate all the miracles from the gospels, and retain what they would call the real Jesus. Mr. Thomas Jefferson essayed that task and signally failed. The so-called "Jefferson's Bible" is entombed in a few comprehensive libraries. It was never read by the masses. There was no heart-throb in it, no

Savior for a lost sinner, no balm for a bruised heart. Furthermore, there was not as much evidence for the Jesus of the Unitarian, Jefferson, as there was for the Jesus of orthodox evangelicalism. The original garment was so rent and torn by the attempt to take out select parts that the part which was taken out was damaged and the part which was left was destroyed. That, I confidently affirm, will be the result of every effort to separate the natural from the supernatural in the gospel portrait of Jesus. The two are inextricably intertwined and no skill can dissociate them.

2. There is a type of criticism which professes to believe only so much of the Bible as it can confirm in the light of modern research. It does not accept the Jesus of the Gospels, but only so much of his teachings and such views of his character as accord with the rules by which they measure. By this method I can prove that Woodrow Wilson never attended Davidson College because that name does not appear upon the register of the College or Literary Society. Or, I can prove that there were two of him there because there were two matriculates at the same time by the name of Thomas Wilson. You can disprove and prove whatever you wish by this method.

It is inexcusable presumption for one to undertake to dissect the Bible and say, "This is genuine because it is in the author's style and this is spurious because it is not in the author's style." Mr.

Bok employed Ex-President Theodore Roosevelt to write for the Ladies' Home Journal anonymously. Every reader was more or less familiar with Mr. Roosevelt's habits of thought and style of expression, but no one guessed aright his authorship.

The identification of spurious passages in the writings of a Bible author of centuries ago by the supposed difference in vocabulary and style is impossible. In the last half of the nineteenth century Dr. Crawford Toy wrote a radical book of Old Testament criticism. That book was reviewed anonymously in the *Religious Herald.* Dr. Robert Ryland, President of Richmond College, read that review and wrote the *Herald* approving it and praising Dr. John A. Broadus as the author. "For," said Dr. Ryland, "although it did not bear his signature, it did bear his ear marks and Broadus was the only man among us who could have written the review." Dr. Broadus read the communication by Dr. Ryland and wrote the *Herald* disclaiming authorship of the review. Whereupon, the Editor announced that Dr. J. C. Hiden wrote the review. Now, there was Dr. Ryland, himself no mean scholar, who knew both Broadus and Hiden intimately, was thoroughly familiar with their traits of mind and modes of expression, and yet who, on a question of literary criticism, erroneously attributed the production of one to the other.

3. Some professed Christians reject the mirac-

ulous *in toto* on the ground that it is unscientific. That is the drift of the Modernists. It would not be far amiss to define Modernism as an attempt to get rid of the supernatural in Christianity. It holds that nature is a system of invariable law and its reign is universal. Then, indeed, is there no room for the virgin birth, for God is a prisoner in his own universe and everything is irrevocably fixed beyond the power of the divine will to intervene. Such an attitude is unscientific and unphilosophical. The force of gravity is, so far as we know, a universal law. Throw a pebble up into the air. For the moment, there is the intervention of a will and a counteraction of the law of gravity. That stone goes upward because a new force comes in to produce a new effect. Cannot the Almighty God, who created and rules the universe, exert his will and produce an effect, and was not the incarnation of his son a sufficient occasion?

Everything does not come about by natural law. Much is achieved by human will. The other night I was with a group of friends hunting in the woods. It became uncomfortably cold. No inexorable law warmed our chilled bodies. We gathered fuel, struck a match, kindled a fire, and warmed ourselves. We brought about, by the exercise of our wills, a combination and a result which the laws of nature alone would never achieve. Cannot the great God do as much and would he not be expected to do as much to warm

into spiritual life and vigor a cold and frozen world? His will did intervene when he revealed his heart of love in Jesus Christ who was a wondrous combination of the human and divine and thus effected reconciliation.

There is electricity. Natural laws never gathered its mysterious forces into light and power for the convenience and service of man. We had never known its value but for the ingenious ability, the inventive will, of man. Who has the omniscience to say that the Almighty did not assert his will in begetting that combination of deity and humanity which is the Light of the world and the Power of God?

4. A final explanation for the agitation against the virgin birth is the mistaken idea of well meaning men that the doctrine is an encumbrance to Christianity. They claim that the mystery attending the doctrine is a stumbling-block to faith. Well, there is mystery in all life. We do not, on that account, discard life.

The beginnings of matter and of man are mysteries. There is less mystery in God begetting Christ through a woman than there is in God creating the first man out of the dust of the earth as Genesis teaches, or out of protoplasm as evolution teaches.

Many inconceivable operations go on daily before our eyes and in our physical and mental make-up. The manner in which a man's will causes his foot to move is inconceivable, but we

continue to move our feet. In fact, you cannot explain "the manner in which any cause operates to produce its immediate effect." A philosopher has said: "Neither physiology nor psychology, nor physiological psychology pretends to offer any explanation of how a man's will affects his brain so as to bring about the contraction of a muscle."

The most avowed Modernist cannot think the virgin birth more incredible than our forefathers would have thought a prediction that their descendants would be robbing the night of its pall and turning darkness into day, flying the air in ships like birds, sending messages thousands of miles over wires and ether waves, listening in their homes to human voices long silenced in death and, even more wonderful, enjoying the music of choirs and orchestras in cities far distant. Mystery! there is mystery all about us. There are many yet unseen realities.

"There are more things in heaven and earth,
Horatio,
Than are dreamt of in your philosophy."

In the incarnation there is mystery. Yes, and blessed reality!

I would have our Modernist brethren to ponder well the words of Huxley from a private letter to the Dean of Wells: "I have not the slightest objection to offer *a priori* to all the propositions in

the three creeds. The mysteries of the Church are child's play compared with the mysteries of nature. The doctrine of the Trinity is not more puzzling than the necessary antinomies of physical speculation; virgin procreation and resuscitation from apparent death are ordinary phenomena for the naturalist. It would be a great error, therefore, to suppose that the Agnostic rejects Theology because of its puzzles and wonders. He rejects it simply because in his judgment there would be no evidence sufficient to warrant the theological proposition, even if they related to the commonest and most obvious every-day proposition."

Should we surrender to the Modernists in their opposition to the virgin birth of Jesus, what would be the result? In the first place, there would not be peace for they would also assail the fact of the bodily resurrection of Jesus, which is the most essential doctrine of Christianity. They would be emboldened to attempt the elimination of all the supernatural from our holy religion and to leave us a shell without a kernel, a body without life, a religion without a divine redeemer. The New Testament is no "scrap of paper" to be torn to bits.

In the second place, we should have to revise our hymnology and delete those magnificent hymns which have warmed and charmed the hearts of young and old,—The Benedictus, The Magnificat, and Gloria in Excelsus. They are

meaningless without the virgin birth; they are misrepresentations.

In the third place, we should find ourselves in the anomalous position of holding to ethical teachings of Jesus for which there is no more historical evidence than for the virgin birth. For, be it remembered, the only two authors who report the much admired address of Jesus to his disciples are the same authors who record his miraculous birth.

In the fourth place, we should not have the Jesus who was the fulfillment of Jewish prophecy, and whose unique personality demanded a unique birth,—the Jesus of the four gospels, of Paul, of historic Christianity,—the only one in whom there "is hope of salvation."

This is too great a price to pay. Peace among brethren is desirable and admirable, but not peace at any price, not peace at the sacrifice of essentials. If such a compromise gave the Modernists peace what of ourselves? With a mutilated gospel, a liberal Jesus, and a merely ethical religion, we should be of all men most miserable,—and the world would be hopelessly lost.

At the season which celebrates the Savior's birth we join in the song of the angels beneath the star-lit sky o'er Bethlehem's fields:

"Glory to God in the highest
And on earth peace
Among men in whom he is well pleased."

We go in gladness with the shepherds to the manger and look with faith and reverence upon the manifold paradox:

"The King of the Universe—hidden in a cave;
The great God—become a little babe;
The Ancient of Days—a new-born infant;
The Eternal One—an hour old."

We stand with Simeon and Anna in the sacred court and rejoice with them in the birth of the Lord's Christ:

"A light for the unveiling of the Gentiles
And the glory of thy people Israel."

We journey with the Magi, scientists of their time, to the house in Bethlehem and see the marvelous child and the modest mother; we fall down with them and worship him and offer to him our gifts of gold as to a king, frankincense as to a god, and myrrh as to a sacrifice.

Thou wonderful babe! There have been many births but never one like thine. Heaven and earth rejoiced when thou camest into the world. Humble and honest sons of the fields, righteous men of religion and pious women of prophetic gifts, devout students of nature and loyal followers of the star of truth recognized thee as the heaven-born Prince of Peace, the Lord's Christ who bringeth salvation, and the new-born King of all ages, races and continents. Thou still hast power to

charm the mind, soothe the heart, and sway the will of all classes of men. May we feel thy power afresh!

"Thee, on the bosom laid
Of a pure virgin mind,
In quiet ever, and in shade,
Shepherds and Sage may find;
They who have bowed untaught to Nature's sway,
And they who follow Truth along the star-paved way."

VII

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS

The fundamental tenet of Christianity is the Resurrection of Jesus. Other doctrines are important; this one is essential. Philosophically, logically, historically and theologically, it is the chief cornerstone of the Christian temple. Philosophically, it explains the change in the disciples from despairing hope and frightful fear to fervent faith and conquering courage; logically, it is the inevitable result of the sinlessness and transcendent goodness of Jesus; historically, it is the source of the New Testament and of Christianity; theologically, it is more than a historical fact for faith—it is the gospel of salvation and service, of morality and immortality. While this doctrine stands, Christianity stands; when it falls, Christianity falls.

The Resurrection is also the most stupendous of supernatural events. Three dead ones were raised to life in the Old Testament; the son of the widow of Zarephath by Elijah, the Shunammite's son by Elisha, and the corpse which touched the bones of Elisha. Three dead ones were raised to life in the Gospels; the daughter of Jairus, the son of the widow of Nain, and Lazarus of Bethany. Two dead ones were raised to life in the

Acts: Dorcas by Peter, and Eutychus by Paul. All eight of these were resuscitations effected through others. But the case of Jesus stands alone in the Bible. Of him it is said that it was not possible for the grave to hold him, that he arose by a power within himself, that the energy of God wrought directly through him.

If this event occurred, all other miracles sink into insignificance compared with its transcendence. Here is the storm-center of Naturalism vs. Supernaturalism. For, if the Resurrection is established, there can be no insuperable difficulty in other miracles. One who admits the Resurrection, can accept all the miracles narrated of Jesus. Indeed, such an one is logically bound to accept everything supernatural for which there is sufficient evidence. The Resurrection of Jesus is the algebraic formula by which to find the solution of the supernatural.

The crucial question is: Did Jesus rise from the dead? What is the truth about this matter? The quest of Science, Philosophy, History, and Religion is truth. When knowledge copies fact, the result is truth. So that, the basis of truth is fact, and intelligence is that knowledge of fact which leads to truth, which is the expression of reality. We shall enquire as to the facts in order that we may arrive at truth.

At the outset we are met by *objections* which must be considered. We may summarize these under four divisions.

1. The Resurrection is impossible. This is urged by those who insist that the laws of nature are invariable, self-operating and universal. The difficulty which the scientist encounters in approaching this subject is his conception of the uniform reign of natural law and his misconception that the Resurrection is a subversion of that law.

The laws of nature are the observed uniformities of nature. They are simply the way in which man has observed that natural forces usually act and interact. But man has observed that the human will has combined and directed the forces of nature, so as to bring about results not otherwise observed, or attained. Man gathers the electricity, long unknown, and makes it serve his purpose in ways which before it never did, by the mere operation of natural law, and which men once thought impossible. No one says that is breaking natural law.

Since man has this freedom of action, this power of working, it is inconceivable that the divine Being should be so fettered as to be unable to interpose his will and counteract the ordinary laws of his working, in order to effect an adequate end. Rightly interpreted, a miracle does not disturb the true conception of the system of nature. If there were no order of nature all phenomena would be alike miraculous. Natural law is God's ordinary method of working; miracles are God's extraordinary method of working. In the one,

God uses means; in the other, he acts immediately. One who believes in a Supreme Being cannot consistently say that the Resurrection was impossible. The Agnostic, John Stuart Mill, was logical when he said: "If there is a God, at all, of course it is absurd to say that miracles are impossible."

Not one person in thousands is an atheist. The only ones I have met in ten years were a group of garrulous and sophisticated youths in Harvard. I shall not stay to reason with that negligible proportion of people—the atheists. I would affirm that no one who believes in a living God can affirm that the Resurrection was an impossibility. Surely in this wonderful universe in which science has discovered so many long-hidden secrets, and seeks yet other mysteries, there is enough to inculcate humility and reverence, to inspire confidence and faith, and to restrain the thoughtful mind from denying the possibility of miracles. Indeed, the growing consciousness of the reality of yet uncomprehended regions of nature (a remarkable feature of the development of modern thought) should prepare us to accept the Resurrection.

2. The Resurrection is incredible. This objection overlooks the nature and character of Jesus. His pure life, unequaled ideals, and incomparable teachings are as exceptional in their realm as is his Resurrection. Given such a personality as Jesus is universally conceded to have been, his

Resurrection is easily credible. It was the fitting and logical end of the life on earth which before or since has had no peer.

Furthermore, this objection is refuted by the fact that the Resurrection has been believed. It was believed by the apostles and all who accepted their testimony. It was believed by Clement of Rome, pupil and companion of Paul, and by Polycarp, disciple of the Apostle John, and the "last witness of the Apostolic Age." It has been believed by all types of mind from that age to this very hour.

Those of high rank, as well as those of low station, have believed that Jesus rose from the dead. Gladstone, the great commoner, and Greenleaf, the authority on evidence, believed and defended the doctrine. Scholarly and critical minds have confessed their belief in this monumental event. Counting numbers does not necessarily prove a proposition, but when that proposition is that a doctrine is incredible, it is pertinent and convincing to count numbers. The vast majority of those who have carefully investigated the Resurrection of Jesus believe that it occurred.

3. The Resurrection is unnecessary. State the situation in a dialogue. Objector: We should have Jesus without the Resurrection. Christian: He would be a myth; the historical Jesus rose from the grave. Objector: The character and life of Jesus are, in themselves, sufficient for faith and

conduct. Christian: Without the Resurrection the character of Jesus is sullied by false claims, and his life was a failure. Objector: The ethical teaching of Jesus stands independent of the great miracle. Christian: But for the Resurrection men had never written the Gospels, and we had not known the ethics of Jesus. Objector: Eliminate the miracle and you facilitate faith and multiply followers. Christian: Such faith would be valueless and such followers useless.

Objector: You cannot show me how the Resurrection was necessary in the Christian system. I think it is an encumbrance. Christian: Every time Jesus mentioned his death he predicted his Resurrection. His Resurrection verified his word and validated his claim. Also, the death of Jesus was a colossal tragedy, and the world is hopeless unless that death was followed by his Resurrection. Objector: I do not believe it. Christian: Paul saw it: "Who was delivered for our offenses, and was raised for our justification," Rom. 4:25. Objector: That is Paulinism, not Christianity. Christian: Paulinism is the Christianity of the Gospels. But I will waive that point and demonstrate by Peter that the Resurrection was necessary to the lordship of Jesus: "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are witnesses. Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord

and Christ," Acts 2:32-36. Peter said it was through faith in the name of the risen Christ that men are made sound (Acts 3:15).

Objector: Do you mean to say that faith in the risen Christ is a condition of being a Christian? Christian: That is precisely what the Scriptures teach: "That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved," Rom. 10:9; cf. Rom. 4:24; 8:34 f.; I Cor. 15:1-4; I Thess. 4:14. Objector: I cannot see how that is necessary. Christian: There were two disciples who did not understand how it was necessary for Christ to suffer, and *to enter into glory,* and did not recognize the risen Christ because their "eyes were holden." But when their eyes were opened they believed and bore testimony. Objector: I believe in Christianity stripped of the miraculous, of the Resurrection. Christian: There would be no Christianity without the Resurrection. The cause of Jesus collapsed temporarily and the Resurrection revived, impassioned and empowered it. The Resurrection created the Church and developed Christianity.

4. The Resurrection is unsubstantiated. Even if it were scientifically possible, and intellectually credible, and logically necessary, say the objectors, the Resurrection of Jesus is not substantiated by evidence. To that objection we now address ourselves. Before eliciting the testimony

it is advisable to ascertain whether or not it can be relied upon; in other words, to show that the documents quoted are historical. Before a document can be considered as evidence in a court, its genuineness must be proved.

This is too large a subject to treat comprehensively in one chapter. That would require a volume. However, it is proposed to verify those books of the New Testament which specifically bear upon the Resurrection of Jesus, to wit: I Corinthians, Acts, and the four Gospels. The first of these books, if verified, would substantiate the Resurrection. All of them can be verified by proofs as strong as those which can be presented for any other equally ancient document outside the New Testament.

It is worthy of note that all the radical critics admit that Paul's first four Epistles,—Romans, I and II Corinthians, and Galatians are authentic, credible, and evidential. Baur dates them as written A.D. 54-58,—a quarter of a century after Christ. If Baur could use them as evidence in attack, we have equal right to use them in defense. The fifteenth chapter of I Corinthians alone is incontrovertible evidence for the historical fact of the resurrection of Jesus. There the witnesses are cited. The supreme qualification of a witness is that he shall tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Paul understands that and boldly states the alternatives: "Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God;

because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not," I Cor. 15:15. Jesus had said: "Ye are my witnesses." The first sermons in Acts all witnessed to the resurrection. The historical fact of the physical miracle of which they were witnesses was the source of their new enthusiasm and the substance of their sermons.

It is also remarkable that the earliest opponents of Christianity never denied the antiquity, or the authenticity, of the documents under consideration. On the contrary, they cited them in their argument and never cited the apochryphal books as having any relevancy to the controversy. An examination of Hierocles, Porphyry and Julian, all adversaries of Christianity, will confirm my statement.

The earliest and ablest of these adversaries was Celsus. About the year 150 A.D. he wrote a book entitled "A True Discourse." It has perished except as it survives in quotations from it, found in Origen's refutation. Those quotations contain thirty-three important gospel facts concerning Jesus, including the disciples' claim of his Resurrection. It is the irony of history that Celsus is a witness to the early existence of the four Gospels. His bitter attack became the unintentional and inadvertent evidence of the historicity of the Evangelists. Three partial citations suffice. "Jesus with his own will expressly declared, as you yourselves have recorded. . . .

The disciples of Jesus wrote such accounts regarding him. . . . All these statements are taken from your own books in addition to which we need no other witness. . . ." These citations are made solely for one purpose, viz.: to prove the early existence of the written Gospels. The favorable and unintentional testimony of an opponent carries great weight before a jury and court.

It remains to enquire: What was the status of the four Gospels among the early Christians? In the closing part of the second century, they were universally received among the Churches. He who denies their genuineness must account for this. The Churches believed that these Gospels came down from the four authors whose names they bore. It was alleged that their genuineness had never been disputed by the Churches. We place four witnesses on the stand.

First witness: Q.—What is your name? A.—Clement. Q.—Where and when were you born? A.—At Athens in the year 160 A.D. Q.—What opportunities, if any, have you had for knowing people and places? A.—I have traveled in Greece, Italy, Syria, and Palestine. Q.—What is your position at present? A.—Head of the Catechetical school in Alexandria. Q.—Have you investigated, and are you familiar with, the four Gospels? A.—I have both studied and taught them. Q.—Here is a statement (reading from a spurious book) purporting to come from one of the Gospels. What do you know about it? A.—Sir, it is not found

"in the four Gospels which have been handed down to us."

Second witness: Q.—Give us your name? A.—Tertullian. Q.—When and where were you born? A.—I was born in Carthage in 150 A.D. Q.—State something about your ancestry and education. A.—My father was a Roman centurion under the proconsular government. He gave me the advantages of the highest education available. I have studied history, philosophy, law, poetry and eloquence. Q.—Can you qualify as an expert on the credibility of documents purporting to be historical? A.—Well, sir, I have made a specialty of judicial matters. My opponents say my Polemics leave the marks of blood. Q.—Have you examined carefully the writings which are commonly called the four Gospels? A.—I have, and have defended the Christian faith before the highest authorities of the State. Q.—What use have you made of those writings? A.—I have quoted them frequently as authority for the facts of the Christian religion. Q.—How could those four writings be used as valid evidences? A.—Because "they were written by apostles, and by apostolic men, their companions." I distinctly implied that Marcion was acquainted with John's gospel and unjustifiably set it aside because he, erroneously, would acknowledge no other than Paul.

Third witness: Q.—State your name and age. A.—Irenæus, I was born at Smyrna in 120 A.D.

Q.—What is your education? A.—I have mastered the Greek learning, sir, and am fond of philosophy. Q.—You are an impractical intellectual, are you? A.—Modesty forbids me to defend my ability, sir, but my friends have been good enough to commend my common sense. Q.—Did you know an apostle? A.—I did not. I was converted under Polycarp, who was converted under the Apostle John. Q.—What is your present position? A.—Pastor of the Church at Lyons, Gaul. Q.—When did you begin your pastorate? A.—In the year 178. Q.—Do you know many Christians? A.—I know and am known by the Churches of Asia Minor, Italy, and Gaul. Q.—You stated a moment ago that you knew a man who knew an apostle. A.—Yes, sir, I stated that I was a disciple of Polycarp and that he was a disciple of John. Q.—Ever talk with Polycarp about John? A.—Many a time. Q.—You mean to say that you are but one generation removed from the apostles? A.—I say so. Q.—And that you were intimate with one who was intimate with the last apostle, and that your friend frequently talked with you about that apostle? A.—I do, sir, and I have quoted from every book of the New Testament except Philemon and the third Epistle of John.

Q.—That is a remarkable statement, but just now you will please confine yourself to what you know of the four Gospels. What I am trying to get at is who wrote those books. A.—I under-

stand your question and am ready to answer it. "Matthew also issued a written Gospel among the Hebrews. . . . Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, did also hand down to us in writing what had been preached by Peter. . . . Luke, also, the companion of Paul, recorded in a book. . . . Afterwards John, the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned upon his breast, did himself publish a Gospel, during his residence in Asia."

Q.—Thank you for your explicit answer. Do you know anything of the transmission, reception, and custody of those writings? A.—I do know and shall be happy to answer: "Which Gospel they first preached, and *afterwards transmitted in writing,* that it might be the foundation and pillar of Faith"; "the Church, though dispersed throughout the earth, received from the apostles and their disciples this Faith. . . ." The Gospel and all the elders, who in Asia conferred with John, the Lord's disciple, witness to the effect that John delivered these things unto them; for he abode until the time of Trajan. And some of them saw not only John, but others of the apostles also, and witness to the aforesaid account.

Q.—I have heard that you were persuaded that there are four true evangelists, and that there could be neither more nor less, because there are four winds. How about that? A.—I am glad you asked that question. My conviction that there are but four Gospels is founded on the witness given by the churches of my acquaintance

and by well-informed individuals whom I know personally. By the analogy of the winds, I meant that the authority of the four Gospels was as well settled as the cosmical system.

Fourth witness: Q.—Your name, if you please? A.—Flavius Justin. Q.—You were born when and where? A.—In Shechem in 110 A.D. Q.—I should like to know something of your youth, if it is not embarrassing to you. A.—Not at all. My parents were Greeks. In youth I was restless and traveled extensively. I tried the different schools of philosophy,—Stoic, Peripatetic, and Platonic—but none of these satisfied the cravings of my nature. Q.—Are you now a professing Christian? A.—I am. Q.—What convinced you and led you to espouse Christianity? A.—A venerable man of benignant countenance observed my unsatisfied condition of soul and counselled me to study the Hebrew prophets. I did so and also investigated the Gospels as to the fulfillment of prophecy. I was convinced before I was twenty-three. It had been my custom to wear a philosopher's garb. I continued to do so after I became a Christian to indicate that I had actually found the true philosophy of life.

Q.—It is rather dangerous to be a Christian, is it not? A.—Yes, the Roman law against secret societies and prohibited religions makes it a crime to be a Christian, but I am ready to attest my faith by my blood. Q.—Have you written any books? A.—I wrote an apology in the reign

of Antoninus Pius, and another in the reign of Marcus Aurelius. I also sought to convert to the Christian faith a Jew by the name of Trypho, and wrote out the Dialogue between us. Q.—Are you familiar with four books alleged to be the four Gospels? A.—Certainly. The study of those books made me a Christian. Q.—Have you ever referred to these books in any of your writings? A.—Sir, I have quoted freely from Matthew and Luke, have used data found exclusively in Mark, and have formulated my doctrinal system in the style, and built it upon the substance, of John. Q.—Are those four writings authentic and accurate? A.—They are. I appealed to the governmental archives in Rome in corroboration of the accuracy of the gospel account of the enrollment under Quirinius, their first procurator in Judea. I also twice appealed to the accounts Pilate transmitted to Tiberius in corroboration of the accuracy of the account of the Crucifixion and Resurrection.

Q.—Did you aim at verbal accuracy in your quotations from the four Gospels? A.—Well, I quoted freely from memory and had no motive to designate carefully what belonged to each Evangelist, but what I said was founded mainly upon the four Gospels. Q.—Just what did you say, if anything, about the Resurrection? A.—I said to Trypho: "Jesus expected you to repent of your wickedness (in crucifying him) *at least after he rose from the dead.* . . . Yet you have

not repented after you have learned that he rose from the dead. . . . You sent men throughout all the world to proclaim that a godless and lawless heresy had sprung from one Jesus when you know that he has risen from the dead and ascended into heaven, as the prophets had foretold that he would." Q.—You said that to a Jew? A.—Yes. Q.—How long after the Crucifixion? A.—About a hundred years. Q.—Now, just what was your authority for using that positive and condemnatory language? A.—The four Gospels which were in circulation at the time and were attested by living witnesses who had known their authors.

We will here rest the case for the genuineness of the four Gospels. Other witnesses are ready to testify—Papias, Clement of Rome, and Barnabas. They would take us well into the first century, to the time of the Evangelists, and would agree substantially with the four witnesses who have testified. Is it asked why those who wrote the Gospels did not sign their names? The reply is that the Evangelists delivered their writings to those who were present and it was needless to sign the name; Paul sent his Epistles to those who were at a distance, and it was necessary, in that case, to prefix his name.

The theory of a late origin of the Gospels did not originate from strict historical investigation, but was invented to fortify a preconception that the divine nature could not have appeared on

earth in human form, as is represented in the Gospels. The authority best qualified to speak upon this question says that the theory has ceased to be tenable by any properly trained scholar. "It has been decisively proved that the books in question could not have been written in the second century." (Ramsay.)

We have identified the Gospels as documents in circulation among the churches, East and West, at an early date and as being accepted as the writings of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. Hold this clearly in mind, and turn and re-read the closing paragraphs in the first four chapters of this book. You cannot escape the conviction that the disciples believed that Jesus rose from the dead. Or, if you are then in doubt, re-read the fifth chapter and try to explain Paul, without the fact of the Resurrection. The sudden transformation and subsequent career of Paul are an enigma without the Resurrection of Jesus. It is more rational to accept the Resurrection than it is to reject it and account for Paul.

As to the alleged discrepancies in the narratives of the Resurrection, they are not more difficult than the truthful testimony of modern witnesses to one event; the variations evidence independence and the absence of collusion; they all agree on the main facts of the Resurrection, that there are no rival records in disproof of the facts. One wishing to go further in resolving these variations in the Evangelists is referred to

Simon Greenleaf's "Testimony of the Evangelists," West's "Observations on the History and Evidences of the Resurrection," and Bowman's "Historical Evidences of the New Testament." Those books settle the question for all who are capable of weighing evidence.

We turn to the consideration of modern theories. Various explanations are offered to get rid of this supernatural event.

1. The swoon theory. This claims that Jesus was not actually dead; that he revived in the cool atmosphere of the new tomb; that he pushed his way out and rejoined his disciples and lived and died a natural death.

This theory raises more difficulties than the miracle which it attempts to explain away. (1) The record states that when the soldiers came to Jesus and the thieves on the cross, Jesus was *dead already,* and the soldiers brake not his legs (John 19:33). (2) The same record states that a soldier pierced Jesus' side with a spear, and that there came forth blood and water. The writer of the record states that he saw this (John 19:34). That one wound fully proved the death of Jesus. The water flowing through the wound indicated that the spear "had penetrated the pericardium, in which that water is lodged, and which being wounded every animal must necessarily die immediately." (Gilbert West). (3) Pilate made careful inquiry and learned that Jesus was dead before he granted

Joseph of Arimathea permission to take the body down from the cross (Mark 15:44 f.) (4) The weakened physical condition of Jesus, even had he not been dead, was such that it was impossible for him to push away the large stone from the tomb with his two hands and to walk away on his nail-pierced feet. This would have been a supernatural feat. (5) Had he escaped the guards, his emaciated presence would have increased the disciples' dismay, and could never have created in them that faith which was fervent, fearless and invincible. (6) It was impossible for him to escape from the tomb and avoid the detection of Roman officials and Jewish foes. (7) Contemporary Roman historians, Tacitus and Pliny, record his death. In short, the swoon conjecture of Paulus is impossible and incredible.

2. The fraud theory. The Jews, whose malice killed Jesus, originated this story and suborned witnesses to testify that the disciples stole the body. On its very face are the marks of falsehood. The disciples would not have stolen the body if they could, and they could not if they would. What good could that body have done them? They were not trying to prove anything: their own faith was in temporary eclipse, and they thought the Crucifixion was the tragic end of all their hopes. Men in such a state of mind would greatly prefer that the body of the lost leader should repose in decent burial in Joseph's tomb.

Not only their state of mind, but also their guileless dispositions, are against the theft theory. Then, their whole subsequent careers, their moral earnestness, their martyr spirit, and denunciation of lying and falsehood would be impossible for conscious deceivers. One must be facile in slander who can charge the straightforward, undesigning disciples with theft.

But had the disciples been the worst of men, and bent on perpetrating a fraud, they had no chance to steal and conceal the body of Jesus. Those Roman guards were an armed defense through which they could not penetrate; that Roman seal was an inviolate protection which they dared not break. However, supposing the improbable, not to say the impossible, that the disciples did steal the body, it would be impossible for them to conceal that body. Every detective in Palestine would have been a hound on the scent until the body was found. Its presentation in court or public would have been a death blow. Then, indeed, would Christianity have perished from the earth, or it would be more accurate to say that Christianity would never have been born. The same objections hold against Holtsmann's theory that Joseph of Arimathea removed the body.

3. The mistake theory. The proponents of this theory say that Jesus actually died, was buried, and his body remained in the tomb. The women made a mistake and found the wrong

tomb. This does not impute dishonesty, but it does impute imbecility; it practically makes fools out of the women and Peter and John.

In all history there is no parallel to such an error. Forty-six years after the battle of Antietam, I visited the battlefield with a deacon who directed a battery in that engagement. He had not been on the field since. Yet, he went directly to the very spot where his battery was placed. "Here is the place," he said. Upon investigation I found a small bronze slab marking that spot as the position of his battery. Being asked how he remembered it so well the deacon replied: "There are some places we never forget."

The Evangelists are particular to state that the women knew the exact location of the tomb. Matthew has it that while Joseph was interring the body, and also after he departed, the women were there (27:16); Mark says the women "beheld where he was laid," 23:55; Luke tells that the women "beheld the sepulcher, and how the body was laid,"—Luke 23:55. John informs us that the sepulcher was in a garden (19:41), not in a cemetery, and therefore, the more easily identified. He must have a deep-seated aversion for the supernatural, a wild and illogical imagination, and a low estimate of the intelligence of others, who can, in the face of all the facts, avow that "the women found the wrong tomb." If

such an egregious blunder was ever made in the history of man, it is unrecorded.

4. The vision theory. The disciples were so agitated that they thought they saw what they did not see. A hysterical woman believed she saw and heard Jesus in the garden. Her hallucination gave to the world "a resuscitated God." Others caught the infection and imagined as reality what was only a vision.

This is the only hypothesis, thus far considered, that has any plausibility. Sceptics like Renan overworked it to explain the appearance of Jesus.

Examine the vision theory. It is unbelievable for the following reasons:

(1) In order to make the reaction in the minds of the disciples more conceivable, by gaining longer time, it violently and unwarrantedly transfers the first appearances from Jerusalem to Galilee. The facts are that there were five appearances on the first day, four in Jerusalem and one about seven and a half miles distant.

(2) It changes every known historical fact,—time, place, nature of the events, mood of the disciples—and invents scenes, conditions, and experiences of which the Gospels know nothing. It does not explain the facts in the record; it *imagines* a set of facts and undertakes to explain them.

(3) It breaks down on its own ground of the

general predisposition to believe in the resurrection of heroes, for it cannot cite an example of belief in the Resurrection of an historical personage such as Jesus was. "What is found is an unwillingness to believe, or to admit, in certain cases, for a time, that the hero is really dead. The Christian Resurrection is thus a fact without historical analogy." (James Orr.)

(4) It is refuted by the fact that Paul distinguishes the actual sight of Jesus from subsequent "visions and revelations" (II Cor. 12:1). Paul never even repeated the words he heard in a moment of ecstasy, in a state of seraphic vision; he did say he had seen the risen Jesus and repeated what was said to him.

(5) The vision theory fails for want of a psychological basis. No good cause is found, in a psychological analysis, for the marvelous and simultaneous outburst of visionary experience among so many in different places during forty days, or for the early and sudden cessation of the appearances.

(6) It fails, finally, because it cannot be harmonized with the historical situation. Take an example; the state of the disciples' minds before and after the Crucifixion. They were dejected and despondent, not looking for an appearance, not expecting anything, and unwilling to believe what they first saw. After the forty days, they were buoyant and confident, and hazarded their liberty and lives for the witness which they bore

to the Resurrection. Philosophically, it is difficult to understand how overexcitement, issuing in visions, could have preceded immediately and produced the calm self-possession and the energy of the disciples, or could have created Christianity with its "lucidity of thought and earnestness of moral activity."

Further, the special view of this theory advanced by Keim, viz.: that Jesus, risen in spirit, actually vouchsafed visions of himself to the disciples and so produced in them the conviction that he had risen in body, makes Jesus responsible for a gross deception. That is ethically impossible.

5. The subconsciousness theory. There is a subtle difference between this and the vision theory. It is more reverent than Renan and has a psychological basis. If there is no objective reality in what does not appeal to subjective consciousness, subjective realization is essential to objective reality. Also, subjective consciousness may give form and color to the formless and colorless. For instance, there is, scientifically speaking, no such thing as color in the ether waves; subjective consciousness gives color to those waves.

Applied to the Resurrection it would mean this; there was no bodily presence, no objective reality of Jesus, except in the sub-consciousness of the disciples. Thus, the objector to the supernatural would dispose of the bodily Resurrection

of Jesus, and at the same time guard the sincerity and intelligence of the disciples and account for the tremendous and beneficent results which were the outcome of belief in the Resurrection.

By way of rejoinder to this theory:

(1) It is too metaphysical to be practical. Telling people there are *per se* no colors in the rainbow appears vastly more fanciful and foolish than all their iridescent dreams. Since before the flood, man has believed in the reality of color, and doubtless will continue to do so. The eye will feast upon the landscape and the ear will thrill to the symphony, and man will enjoy beauties and harmonies so long as he can see and hear.

(2) It invalidates the laws of evidence. The Resurrection is a question of fact to be established by evidence. Over five hundred witnesses, under a variety of circumstances, testify that they saw the risen Jesus. They testify that they saw him at a distance, but oftener close at hand; saw him as individuals, but oftener in groups; saw him in the light of the early morning, in the brightness of the noonday sun, in the twilight of the afternoon, and in the cover of night; saw him in the garden, on the highway, by the seaside, on the mountain, in the country, in the city, in the house and in the open outdoors; and saw him in the intimacies of personal fellowship.

Deny the objective reality and substitute the

subjective consciousness and you violate every known rule of legal evidence and reduce all trials and all life to absurdity. A man charged with arson, but who did not commit the crime, could be convicted on the testimony of witnesses whose subconsciousness told them he burned the house. There may have been no fire, no objective reality, but only their subconsciousness. Indeed, there is no such thing as fire, according to this theory. The whole theory can be disproved by the subconscious psychologist putting his hand in the fire.

(3) It rejects the testimony of the senses. The disciples by the senses of sight, touch and hearing, vouched for the bodily Resurrection of Jesus. What they thought they saw they confirmed by touch, and his voice their ears heard.

But these senses are not to be relied upon, according to the subconscious theory. There was no objective reality, no actual sight, touch and hearing of an outside object; there was merely that mysterious something within them which made them believe in objective reality.

See where this theory would lead; I think that I have a daughter, that we resemble each other in features, in the habit of promptness, and in some other respects; that we love each other and that she fills a large place in my life. But my daughter has no bodily presence, no objective reality, she exists only in my subconsciousness. To such absurdities does this theory lead!

The knowledge based upon the facts of the Resurrection leads to this truth; there were both an objective reality,—the body of Jesus,—and a subjective consciousness,—the personal experience of that reality by the disciples.

6. The spiritual theory. Radical pulpits are heard to this effect: Christ's Resurrection was wholly spiritual, a continuous manifestation of himself; his personality survived the cross and manifested itself to the minds of the disciples. They were spiritual yet real manifestations, "telegrams from heaven," assuring them that he still lived and laying a firm foundation for belief in immortality. Psychical research is thought to offer support for this theory in the data collected on apparitions of the dead. It is insisted, by its advocates, that the objectionable features of the orthodox theory are removed and faith's fortress saved.

This theory is untenable for obvious reasons:

(1) Psychical apparition is not an explanation of the Resurrection as Apostolic Christianity understood it, but a substitute "which is in principle a negation of Apostolic affirmation."

(2) Assuming that Jesus was on earth a spiritual personality wedded to a material body, we must believe, according to Sir Oliver Lodge, "that the connection between spirit and body is more than temporary. In essence it is permanent."

(3) The rising of Christ from the dead does

not rest upon the elusive, precarious, and often misleading data of modern psychical phenomena.

(4) Christ's prediction was false in the light of this theory, for he predicted that his body would rise: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up," John 2:19.

(5) The documentary evidence proves that the risen Jesus had a body: "Behold my hands and my feet that it is I myself; handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have. And when he said this, he shewed them his hands and his feet," Luke 24:40. That is the account of a learned physician. Obviously, the disciples at first thought it was an apparition, that the manifestation was wholly spiritual, and Jesus corrected their mistaken ideas. The women also held him by the feet (Matt. 28:29), and he forbade Mary, *to keep clinging to him,*—meaning of the Greek (John 20:16). What nature of body he had, we shall see later; but he had a body.

(6) Paul builds the hope of immortality upon the Resurrection of the body of Jesus and argues the resurrection of our bodies from the proposition that Christ's body was raised (I Cor. 15). The believer's expectation is that Christ "shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body," Phil. 3:21.

(7) The final and sufficient answer to the spiritual Resurrection, and to every other false theory, is the *empty tomb.* More eloquent than

speech, more convincing than logic, is that empty tomb outside the city gate.

By way of recapitulation, we have seen: that the Resurrection is the palladium of Christianity, —the fundamental and essential doctrine and the apex of supernaturalism; that the documentary evidence relied upon to support the fact is genuine and trustworthy; that the several objections to the doctrine are swept away by the force of reason and the power of truth; that all attempted explanations, in conflict with the orthodox view, fail to explain, and must be rejected; and that the Resurrection is substantiated by the strongest circumstantial, and by the most positive and direct, evidence.

We shall now see the *significance* of the Resurrection of Jesus:

1. It demonstrates his deity. The Resurrection confirmed his truthfulness, proved his claims, and vindicated his character. "He was declared to be the Son of God with power, by the Resurrection from the dead."

2. It demonstrates the completion of redemption. The Resurrection was not only an evidential fact for deity; it was a constitutive element of the gospel. Jesus died as a means of salvation to the world (Matt. 20:28; 26:26-28; John 3:14-16; Rom. 5:6; I Pet. 2:24). But had he remained permanently in the state of death, he could not have redeemed the world. It is clear

from the historical situation that not a gospel sermon would have been preached. The work of redemption was completed in the Resurrection. God thus publicly accepted the death of Jesus as the basis of reconciliation. Death plus Resurrection equals perfected redemption. "When he had made purification for sins he sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high," Heb. 1:3 (cf. 10:12, 13; Acts 2:33; Rom. 6:10).

3. It demonstrates that Jesus lives with and in his people. He had said he would be with them. Could he keep that promise? The Resurrection and Pentecost and Apostolic missions are the answer. He had said we live in him as the branch lives in the vine. But if the vine be dead, so is the branch. A dead branch may be found on a live vine, but not a live branch on a dead vine. This vital union of the believer with Christ becomes more precious after the Resurrection (Rom. 6:3-11). The believer is risen with Christ (Col. 3:1), and the Christian life is the outliving of the inliving Christ (Gal. 2:20). In our inmost souls we have *felt* his living presence. Our experience attests the Resurrection.

4. It demonstrates the existence of a future life. Mankind has always wondered about the future life. Philosophers had speculated, saints had hoped, and prophets had intimated. There was reason to conclude that this life was not a term complete in itself, but a passage to a larger

life. What was needed was a demonstration of that larger life; we have it in the Resurrection of Jesus.

5. It demonstrates the identity of personality after death. The risen body of Jesus was the same as before, and yet not the same. The wounds were there, and yet he was free from the former material conditions. The flesh had not decayed; it had been transformed. The temporary etherealization of the Transfiguration on the mount became permanent in the Resurrection. The body of his humiliation had become the body of his glory, and his disciples identified him as the same Jesus they had known before.

6. It demonstrates the ultimate triumph of the Christian. Jesus' victory was our victory, if we believe in him. His own word for that is: "Because I live, ye shall live also," John 14:20. The body of his glory is the type of our resurrection bodies. "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection," Rom. 6:5.

The material particles of our flesh, unlike that of Jesus, will return unto dust; there will be no continuation of this body; as a physical body, it will distintegrate and disappear. That will not be the end of us. There is coming a day of transformation "that mortality might be swallowed up of life," II Cor. 5:4. "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body," I Cor. 15:44. This indicates at once identity and difference. Do you

ask an explanation of the relation between the body you now have and the body you shall have in the resurrection? It is a mystery: "Behold, I show you a mystery." A mystery can be announced and accepted, it cannot be explained. The other day in the Philosophy Class at Princeton I heard Professor Spaulding say that we do not know, and we cannot explain, the method by which the sun pulls the earth; but it pulls and we live under that law of gravitation. In like manner we accept the mystery of a change of a natural to a spiritual body as a coming event prefigured in the Resurrection though we cannot understand it.

Enough to say, we shall be like the first fruits, —Jesus was the first fruits. Life fashioned the bodies we now wear; the risen Christ shall "fashion anew" our bodies so as to conform to the body of his glory. Do you ask how? It is written: "According to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself," Phil. 3:21. Do you ask when? It is written: "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory," Col. 3:4.

VIII

THE DEITY OF CHRIST

The waters are troubled. A severe storm agitates the scientific ocean and shakes the ship of many an educational institution. Some have been made seasick and many have the uncomfortable feeling which often precedes nautical nausea. Others, old sea travelers, are undisturbed; they sit steadily in the boat, confident she will reach her destined port without serious injury or great loss of valuable cargo. Others are in glee over the storm; they believe it is conducive to health—it eliminates the bile and tones up the constitution.

While this storm is raging a hurricane strikes the ship. Shall we say from another direction? Or does it come from the same direction? An Episcopalian clergyman affirms that Jesus did not have the power of God; his bishop hesitates to subject him to discipline because his statements are "ambiguous"; an editor of the *Southern Churchman* espouses the cause of the first rector and criticizes the bishop for the manner in which the bishop addressed him; another clergyman challenges the bishop to state his own views; and a Jewish rabbi indorses the first-mentioned rector and proposes Judaism as a basis of union. That

is a swirling hurricane, is it not? It is, in Shairp's fine phrase, "a sea of doubt raging wildly round about."

Whither are we drifting? Let us take our bearings, consult our chart. Was Jesus more than man,—the highest type of man? Was he the unique Son of God?

In the Synoptists others applied to Jesus the term "Son of God." Luke used that name because Jesus' human nature was the special creative act of God, Luke 1:35. Even the demons recognized Jesus' deity and dreaded "the Son of God," Matthew 8:29. Peter made the confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God"; and Jesus accepted and commended the confession, Matthew 16:16. Before the Sanhedrin Jesus' affirmative answer to the question as to whether he was the Son of God, so angered the Jews that they instantly charged him with blasphemy. However much the critics may whittle down or explain away the reply of Jesus, the Jews who heard him understood him to say he was God, Luke 22:66-71.

There is among certain schools an antipathy to the Johannine theology. Any quotation from John's theology is rejected at once. So, for argument's sake, I will omit, in this connection, any of John's strictly theological statements and confine the quotations to two of his historical testimonies. "Therefore the Jews sought to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said that

God was his Father, making himself equal with God," John 5:18. "Equal with God." That is not taken from "outworn creeds." It is in the inspired creed, the one to which Baptists have always subscribed. What new and larger interpretation can be as authentic as the testimony of those who heard the Master's words fall from his lips and were eyewitnesses of his works?

The Jews utterly rejected the stupendous claims of Jesus, but they were not so stupid as to miss their significance. In their wrath they were too honest to say he did not claim deity. "The Jews answered him saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God," John 10:33. They knew what blasphemy meant. To their minds Jesus was a blasphemer because he said he was God. No ambiguity there! This should settle the question of whether Jesus claimed to be more than a good man or a prophet. It creates the dilemma: Jesus was either more than a good man and a prophet, or he was neither a good man nor a prophet. As Anselm stated it: "He is either God, or not a good man."

Again, the supernatural personality of Jesus was the cause of his death. Had he been no more than human, the Jews would not have killed him. They slew him because he professed to be God. Now, an important rabbi denies both facts; that the Jews slew Jesus and that Jesus claimed deity. Within two months after the crucifixion of Christ,

Peter told the Jews of their crime to their face: "Ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." He also in the same address, proved the proposition that Jesus was the Messiah: "God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ," Acts 2:23, 36. Rational people, accepting this record cannot consider Jesus simply a martyr. He was either a criminal and deserved capital punishment under the law, or he was the suffering servant of Isaiah, the Old Testament Messiah, by whose stripes we are healed.

Anent religious persecution: I belong to a denomination which has never shed any blood, except its own, for conscience' sake. In the interest of historical accuracy, and not to keep alive religious antipathies, it must be stated that the Jews were the instigators of persecution between Jews and Christians. Their hate knew no bounds when they had power. Their champion should be careful in laying charges of persecution at the door of Christians. Let him state the whole truth.

It is significant that Jesus always distinguishes his own relation to God from the relation of others to God. He speaks of "my Father" and of "your Father," but never includes himself in the expression, "our Father." You must face that fact in the Gospels. It clearly substantiates his unique sonship. He and those who wrote the record, knew that his sonship differed from that of others.

The exalted place occupied by Jesus in the New

Testament is that which he himself took. This is the very thing which gives unity to the book. His subsequent followers have never, in sermon or creed, attributed more to him than he claimed and his inspired apostles believed.

Solomon was wise and great, but "a greater than Solomon was here," Matthew 11:42. Once Jesus demanded of the scribes whose son the Messiah was. They replied: "David's." Jesus then asked why David called him Lord, Mark 11:35-37. Jesus meant that he, the Messiah, was the son of God in such a sense that the greatest of the Hebrew Kings called him "Lord." The Pharisees disbelieved but "the common people heard him gladly." Their common sense was impressed by the sincerity of the Master. In the same connection Jesus said: "Beware of the scribes." Today the common people are loyal to the deity of our Lord. They wait upon a ministry where his deity is honored. Alas! we must repeat the warning, "Beware of the scribes."

The four evangelists all ascribed to Jesus miraculous powers. He opened the eyes of the blind, unstopped the ears of the deaf, healed the sick, raised the dead. That distinguished Jewish scholar, Edersheim, whose open mind to the truth led him to Christ, has aptly said: "If he be not the Messiah, he has at least thus far done the Messiah's works. If he be not the Messiah, the world has not, and never can have a Messiah." I believe that any Jew who will divest himself of

his prejudice and read with truth-seeking purpose "The Life and Times of Jesus" by Edersheim, will be convinced that Jesus was the Christ.

History presents many contrasts. One night, long ago, a scholarly and influential Jew came to Jesus and said, "We know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that thou doest except God be with him." That is, he was so impressed by the miracles of Christ that he wanted to join him. One night recently, a modern Jew denied the miracles of Jesus and intimated that Christians unite with Jews on that basis. One lived in the time of Christ and knew; the other lives in a time when he has abandoned all hope of a Messiah, denied the miraculous and wrapped himself in the garment of doubt.

Did Jesus have the power of God? He said so. His own words are, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." Vested with that authority, he gave a command which was foolhearted for any one but God to give. In that command, he announced a formula which placed the Son and Holy Spirit on equality with the Father. Prior to this, he had said, "I and the Father are one." If they were one, Jesus not only had the power of God, but was God. To that effect is his statement to Philip, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

Not only did Jesus profess to have all power. The apostles affirmed that the power in which they wrought miracles came from Christ. "Æneas,

Jesus maketh thee whole; arise and make thy bed," Acts 9:33. Peter had previously disclaimed superior power or holiness in himself and ascribed the glory to Jesus, the Prince of Life. "And his name through faith in his name hath made this man strong," Acts 3:16.

Consider Jesus. He comes forward as the supreme and final Revealer of truth, superior to the scribes and even to Moses. He hesitates not before the most intricate moral questions. He is familiar with the scenery of the other world. He came from God, returns to God, knows perfectly the will of God, is "the way, the truth, and the life."

He insisted upon absolute obedience to himself as the Sovereign of the conscience and the Savior of the soul. He called to men, "Follow me." He bade them "let the dead bury their dead." He declared the "Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins." He warned men that their eternal destiny would depend upon their attitude to him. He announced penalties and rewards which would be endured or received beyond the grave. No other character in history impinged such vital issues upon his own person.

He lived a life of sinlessness, unselfishness, service, sacrifice, love. You can name no other to match him in this respect, his enemies being the judges. Should God come to-day and dwell among men, we can have no higher conceptions of his conduct than that exhibited by Jesus.

He calmly gave commands and promised powers becoming none but Deity. His disciples obeyed those commands, experienced the fulfillment of those promises and grew shortly to be the strongest force in the world. Their deeds validated the authority of their commander. The growth of his spiritual empire justified his largest prediction.

That the God-Man is a mystery is frankly conceded. This does not discredit the fact. Man is a mystery to himself. He has a physical power,—body; a thinking power,—mind; a loving power,—heart, united in himself; each capable of individual activity, and yet all making one man. He cannot penetrate this mystery, but he acts daily upon the fact. Man's complexity is a perplexity which he accepts. Is it consistent, is it reasonable, to reject the fact of Christ's complex person because one has no philosophy for the fact? Be as logical as Browning:

"I say, the acknowledgment of God in Christ
Accepted by the reason, solves for thee
All questions in the earth and out of it,
And has so far advanced thee to be wise.
Wouldst thou disprove this to reprove the proved?"

Who then was Jesus? What say the witnesses? Demons from below cry out, "Son of God"; the Father from the bending heavens speaks, "My belovèd Son in whom I am well pleased"; the

Samaritans, who doubted the woman, heard him and added, "We know that this is indeed the Christ, the Savior of the world"; the traitor, who sold him wails "innocent"; Pilate, who tried him, renders the verdict, "I find no fault in him"; the centurion who superintended the execution witnesses, "Truly this man was the Son of God"; Thomas, who had been perplexed, exclaims, "My Lord and my God"; Paul, who fought him, testifies, "The image of the invisible God," "Equal with God"; Peter writes of him, "Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being subject unto him"; the unknown author of Hebrews begins, "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high"; John, who felt his heart beat, says, "The word was with God and the word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life, and the life was the light of men. . . . And the word was made flesh and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, glory as of

the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth."

What say ye? Have the believing heart. This is essential to the discovery and retention of saving truth,—perhaps of all truth. When the deity of our Savior is being assailed, and perchance mists of doubt momentarily obscure your vision of the Sun of Righteousness, be guided by Tennyson's protest in "In Memoriam":

"If e'er when faith had fallen asleep
I heard a voice, 'Believe no more,'
And heard an ever breaking shore
That tumbled in the godless deep;

"A warmth within the breast would melt
The freezing reason's colder part
And like a man in wrath, the heart
Stood up and answered, 'I have felt.'"

IX

THE MISTAKES OF THE MODERNISTS

A third of a century ago a brilliant orator was lecturing upon the American platform on "The Mistakes of Moses." Thoughtful hearers commented that the lecture was notable more for ridicule than for logic, and it is now evident that the mistakes attributed to Moses were mostly the mistakes of the highly paid speaker.

The Modernists have said enough of recent months for one to express a frank judgment upon them. It would not be considerate to intimate that any of them have courted notoriety, but in utmost charity one may say they have no cause to complain of a lack of newspaper publicity. Much of it fills us with chagrin. We read hasty words from ministers of the gospel whose responsibilities, if not their years, should sober them. Some amateurs in controversy are rushing in with threatening and defiance. They appear as impetuous boys exclaiming: "I dare you! If you do this I'll do that!" All of which gets us nowhere. The judgment which I express is that they are making egregious blunders.

They are mistaken in supposing that the profound thinkers must be Modernists. It ill becomes one to cast a reflection upon the intelligence of

those whose opinions differ from his own. Yet, running through the utterances of the Modernists is the implication that those who do not agree with them are not thinkers. They do not demonstrate their assumed intellectual superiority; they simply assert, or imply, the inferiority of others.

Conceit is not a trait of the highest Christian intelligence; modesty is. Disdain of another's ability is not a Christian virtue; consideration is. Anyway, the real thinker does not boast or belittle. He knows that wisdom is justified of her children. He goes on his way thinking his thoughts, voicing his views, wishing that nothing but the truth may prevail, and trusting the intelligence of the people to sift the chaff of error from the wheat of truth. The intelligence of the masses of Christians is higher than the Modernists suppose. Among the conservatives are men not one whit behind the Modernists in the power of concentration, in mental acumen, in technical scholarship, in intellectual honesty. Wisdom will not die with the Modernists.

A distinction should be made between the thinker and the scholar. There be men who are in no sense scholars but who are deep thinkers. They may be laborers in factories, blacksmiths at the forge, farmers remote from universities—men endowed with massive minds, men who have brooded long upon the great questions of origin and destiny, divine sovereignty and free will, nature and revelation. Indeed, the most original

mind I ever knew was that of a man who never attended college. He was a devout believer in the supernatural; had the child-like faith which Jesus commended.

Another mistake of the Modernists is in supposing that they have a monopoly of the best scholarship. Their claims of scholarship are bold; their proofs are invalid. Such is their intellectual arrogancy that they have denied the scholarship of the Episcopal Bishops who do not agree with them, that is, an overwhelming majority of the Bishops. It had been my impression that the Bishops of those denominations who have the special office represented the best in those denominations; in character, piety, common sense, scholarship and general ability. Heretofore, we have thought they were chosen for the office because they possessed those qualifications. Now we are told they are administrators but not scholars. That is the Modernist method of answering the conservatism of the Bishops; no proof, simply an unwarranted, and I believe unjust, assertion.

But apart from the Bishops whose scholarship is now challenged by rectors of whom we never heard before; what have these rectors with which to impeach the scholarship of Richard Chenevix French, who hurled back the assaults on the miracles and vindicated the supernatural in the Gospels; Alexander Balmain Bruce, professor of Apologetics in Glasgow, who accepted and expounded the miraculous element in the Gospels;

Ira M. Price of the University of Chicago, whose ample testimony from the monuments, all corroborate the Bible; George P. Fisher of Yale University, whose scholarly work on "The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief" stands like a Gibraltar against the pop-gun shots of radicals; Francis Smith, distinguished scientist of the University of Virginia, whose book, "Christ and Science" proves as supernatural a Christ as the most orthodox could claim; J. Gresham Machen of Princeton Theological Seminary, whose lectures in the city of Richmond would convince any unbiased scholar that the supernatural Jesus of the Gospels was the source of Paul's doctrine of redemption; David Smith, whose large and scholarly volume, "The Days of His Flesh," establishes the fact that the Christ of the conservatives is the Christ of the Scriptures; Sir William Ramsay, whose superb scholarship was devoted to investigating the accuracy of Luke and Paul and who confirmed them in every disputed issue; S. L. Bowman whose monumental volume on "Historical Evidence of the New Testament" perhaps no Modernist has read and no one can refute; and A. T. Robertson's "Luke the Historian in the Light of Research" which demonstrates that the critics are wrong and Luke is right in the birth-story and every other particular. These are scholars whom the Modernists would be proud to claim. They are unable to disqualify these scholars or to answer them.

Again, the Modernists are mistaken in supposing that the virgin birth was not believed by Christians from the beginning. One of them declared a while ago that it was a dogma "clamped upon the Church in the Dark Ages." That is surely a reckless statement without any historical support whatever. One to make it might be convicted of living in "dark ages." The virgin birth is in the Apostles' Creed. Adolf Hamack has shown that the Apostles' Creed "can, in its present form, be traced back with certainty to the beginning of the sixth or the end of the fifth century." It existed in a somewhat different form before the beginning of the Dark Ages, the fall of Rome (476). In every form in which it existed it contained the doctrine of the virgin birth. The Council of Nicea antedated the fall of Rome one hundred and fifty-one years. That Council unequivocally affirmed the doctrine of the eternal deity of Christ in these words: "We believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, begotten of the Father, the only begotten, of the essence of the Father, God of God, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made in heaven and on earth; who for us men, and for our salvation, came down and was incarnate, and was made man." This was in the year 325. It is indisputable as to date and contents. How can a man who preaches to an intelligent congregation, which believes in a creed, have the

effrontery to locate the origin of that article of their creed in the Dark Ages? And he prates about scholarship! His fellow denominationalists may well blush, and many of them do.

The fact is that this doctrine was held by post-apostolic Christians long before there were any church councils or creeds. Ignatius of Antioch, said about the year 110: "He was truly of the race of David according to the flesh, but the Son of God by Divine will and power, truly born of a virgin." Celsus, a Greek philosopher, wrote a book aginst Christianity about the year 178. His testimony evidences, by its opposition, what was the settled faith of the early Christians. He ridicules them for believing and teaching the incarnation by means of the virgin birth. He specifically refers to Joseph's dream and to the genealogies of Matthew and Luke. Concessions made by an enemy are important in historical investigation. The difference between Celsus and the Modernists is that while they both deny the miraculous conception, Celsus admitted that it was taught in Matthew and Luke and believed by the Christians in the first century after Christ. The Modernists would say with Celsus: "What need was there to breathe into the womb of a woman?" Let them also concede with Celsus that the earliest Christian faith believed that as a fact, and then frankly admit that they depart from the faith. Let them not try to have others believe they represent the faith and facts of early Christianity. Let them

acquire the scholarship and candor of the liberal and somewhat radical Hastings' Dictionary when it says: "Indeed, the wide-spread belief of the early Church in the *Virgin Birth* can be reasonably accounted for only by the occurrence of the fact itself." Let us say with the same great book: "Supernatural conception appears a really befitting and credible preface to a life which was crowned by resurrection from the dead."

Again, the Modernists are mistaken in supposing that they have discovered any new truth. The only thing new is the historical anacronisms which some of them perpetrate upon the public. Certainly their views of Jesus are not new. Their human Jesus is no discovery of modern research. The French skeptics and the German critics have said what they are saying, and said it better. The Ebionites, before the close of the first century, denied the reality of Christ's divine nature and held him to be merely a man. The Arians, who were condemned at Nicea in Bithynia, denied the integrity of the divine nature in Christ and regarded him as the first and highest of created beings. The Nestorians denied the real union between the divine and the human natures in Christ, making it a moral rather than an organic one; and Nestorius was removed from the Patriarchate of Constantinople for his heretical theory in 431. There was then more discipline for false doctrine than now. In short, the Modernists are rehashing old views about Jesus—views which are incom-

patible with the Gospels, which have never been accepted by a majority of Christians, and for which men have been disfellowshiped.

The orthodox view is that of the New Testament, viz.: that in Jesus Christ there are two natures, a human nature and a divine nature, and that you cannot divide the person or confound the natures. This is at once a divine revelation and an inscrutable mystery. The New Testament says as much: "Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifested in the flesh." Mystery is no disproof of reality, no barrier to faith. It is evidence of reality and invitation to faith.

"Strong Son of God, immortal love,
Whom we, who have not seen thy face,
By faith, and faith alone, embrace,
Believing where we cannot prove.

"Thou seemest human and divine,
The highest, holiest manhood thou;
Our wills are ours, we know not how;
Our wills are ours to make them thine."

Still another mistake of the Modernists is in supposing that their theory is workable. The proof of the pudding is in the eating; some have eaten the Modernist pudding and have been made very sick. The tree is judged by its fruits. If Modernism is what its advocates claim, the results should appear in churches where it is

preached. On a recent Sunday I preached in Tremont Temple, Boston, and the Lord's Supper was observed at the close of the service. More than 1,300 people partook of the Supper. The Pulpit at Tremont Temple gives forth no uncertain sound. It has always been loyal to the Supernatural Jesus. On the way to the hotel from the Temple I passed by King's Chapel, the oldest Unitarian Church in the United States, and one highly endowed. They observe the Episcopal forms and were partaking of the Lord's Supper. A count showed forty persons present. Judged by the attendance upon the church services, by the souls won to Christ, by the young men recruited for the ministry and by the contributions to missions, a conservative Church will excel a Modernist Church in any and every fair comparison. People have doubts enough of their own. On the Lord's day, in the Lord's house, from the Lord's servant they need faith and they want it. They hunger and thirst for a constructive program, a positive gospel. Negations are wearisome; affirmations are heartening. It is unprofitable employment for a minister to use the time intended for declaring the whole counsel of God in metaphysical vaporings and speculative gymnastics. The people wait for the "word of the Lord."

By the time one is set apart to the regular gospel ministry he should have passed through the transitional period of doubt and have reached a

degree of certainty concerning those things wherein he has been instructed and which he is ordained to preach. Should further doubts arise, let him believe his beliefs and doubt his doubts and not doubt his beliefs and believe his doubts. Let him go among the sorrowing and sinning masses, put his heart against the pulsing heart of humanity, be much in prayer, Bible study, and evangelistic effort, and he will come off more than a conqueror—win for himself the fight of faith and have surplus strength to help others in their battles.

Furthermore, the Modernists are mistaken in supposing that they are doing more good than harm. 1. They are stirring up a few radical men, who are as extreme on one side as the Modernists are on the other, to give utterances to as foolish, though not as destructive sentiments, as the Modernists. 2. They are raising unnecessary questions in the minds of many who wonder what it is all about; who cannot understand how men ordained to preach the New Testament should devote their time to dissecting it and explaining it away. 3. They are diverting their attention, and that of others, from the practical and pressing problems of Christianity, to criticism and controversy. 4. They are, unintentionally I wish to believe, reflecting upon the character and candor of Jesus who taught us to believe in the unseen and inscrutable and said he was too honest to permit us to be deceived: "If it were not so I would

have told you." 5. They are sowing discord and disturbing the "peace of Zion" by preaching "another gospel" which is no gospel. Paul's words come to mind: "There be some that trouble you and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed," Gal. 1:8 f. 6. They are doing irreparable injury to the souls of lost men. A Jesus who was not as truly God as man, is disqualified as the mediator; he cannot by his death on the cross reconcile a holy God and sinful man. A salvation by character is no salvation. It dooms the race to destruction: "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." The universal conscience of man testifies that he is a sinner. An observation of universal history testifies that man cannot redeem himself. The Bible and Christian experience testify that man cannot establish his own righteousness but must submit himself to the righteousness of God "which is by faith in Jesus Christ."

"There is but One who ne'er rebelled,
But One by passion unimpelled,
By pleasures unenticed;

"He from himself his semblance sent,
Grand object of his own content
And saw the God in Christ."

If salvation is by character what becomes of the woman taken in sin, or of the woman of

Sychar; of Zaccheus the extortioner, or Saul the blasphemer? What becomes of Cowper's stricken deer that left the herd if there is no One who has himself been hurt by archers to find him and draw the arrow from the panting side and heal and bid to live? What becomes of Burns' "tempest driven" if there is not the sure anchor of "a correspondence fixed in heaven"? What becomes of Shakespeare's "souls that were forfeited once" without "the world's ransom, blessed Mary's son"? Oh, what becomes of any and all of us? Expurgate your literature, excise the four Gospels and tear up the Epistles, if salvation is by character. They teach salvation for every sinner through faith in the redeeming blood and good works as the fruit, not the root, of that faith.

Finally, the Modernists are mistaken in supposing that they will triumph. They announce that you might as well attempt to dam Niagara as to stay the tide of Modernism. Men have made such vain boasts before. They have said that within a hundred years there would be no Bibles; they have emblazoned the motto, "To take the crown of deity from Jesus' brow"; but the circulation of the Bible grows apace and Jesus, in the thought of millions, still wears his crown. The only triumph they can win is in a questionable and temporizing compromise by timid officials who take counsel of their fears instead of contending earnestly for the faith. "Can two walk together, except they be agreed?"

"Either in sullen truce or bitter strife
Still dwell together, but still dwell apart."

The great body of men and women in all the denominations are loyal to "the faith which was once delivered unto the saints" and they will remain so. It was laymen of intelligence and standing who took the initiative and in response to whose petition the Bishops issued their pastoral letter which so provoked the Modernists. The hearts of those in the pews, with exceptions here and there, beat true to the divine Savior.

Then a majority of the ministers, among them men the peers of Modernists in any arena, feel like Paul: "I am set for the defense of the gospel." They will instruct their congregations, confirm their faith, vindicate their doctrine, and demonstrate that we have not followed cunningly devised fables.

There is a Scripture of solid comfort to troubled minds in these unsettled times: "For we have not any power against the truth, but in behalf of the truth." Fret not yourselves because of assaults upon things sacred. They have withstood assaults more vicious. They have, like the oak, become more deeply and firmly rooted in believing hearts during the storms. Jesus Christ guaranteed perpetuity to the institution he founded. Hear his promise: "Upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." No weapon formed against that institution pros-

pered. It has an impregnable foundation. It is indestructible and irresistible.

"The church's one foundation
Is Jesus Christ her Lord;
She is his new creation
By water and the word;
From heaven he came and sought her
To be his holy Bride;
With his own blood he bought her,
And for her life he died.

"Though with a scornful wonder,
Men see her sore opprest,
By schisms rent asunder,
By heresies distrest;
Yet saints their watch are keeping,
Their cry goes up 'how long?'
And soon the night of weeping
Shall be the morn of song.

" 'Mid toil and tribulation,
And tumult of her war,
She waits the consummation
Of peace for evermore;
Till with the vision glorious
Her longing eyes are blest,
And the great church victorious,
Shall be the church at rest."

X

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE BIBLE AND SCIENCE

Christians who accept the Bible as the inspired and authoritative word of God are hearing and reading disquieting things nowadays from religious sources. The names of renowned scientists are heralded from the pulpits as guides to truth, though such scientists disbelieve in the Saviorhood of him who said, "I am the truth." One may hear pulpit utterances which make the impression that the agnostic, Huxley, is to be believed rather than Moses. It is urged that we must revise our interpretations of Genesis so as to adjust them to the theories of Darwin and Huxley. Neither of these men would so much as affirm the existence of God nor even that there was an intelligent purpose in nature. As to Moses, a process of criticism has been going on which denies his authorship of the Pentateuch; as to Darwin and Huxley, a practice of praise is taking place which exalts them to positions of great teachers of divine truth. In fact they were agnostics as were their contemporaries, Spencer and Tyndall. Darwin had the greatest brain of the four. Though not the most logical, he was the most reverent. In the closing chapter of his "Origin of Species" he refers to the Creator and

he did contribute to Foreign Missions. But after giving him all the credit he so richly deserves it is a lamentable fact that his theories and pursuits landed him in agnosticism. Why do ministers eulogize the agnostics instead of those founders of modern science—Bacon, Kepler, Galileo, Harvey and Newton—who accepted the unity, order and progression of Genesis; who believed there was "mind," "thought," "Almighty power," "design," "intelligence" and "an intelligent Agent" in nature.

Be it remembered that the Christian is a lover of truth. He welcomes it from whatever source it comes. His attitude is that of cordiality. He has nothing to fear from truth. His concern is to know "what is truth." He asks that question with more seriousness, with a deeper sense of personal responsibility, with a finer loyalty to its answer than did Pilate in the judgment hall long ago.

The Christian holds that God revealed truth in the Bible. It is the Christian's text book in morals and religion. By its precepts he is bidden to live and in the comfort of its promises he hopes to die. The Bible is the Christian's chart and compass on the sea of life. Without it he is driven and tossed by winds of false doctrine.

But it is insistently averred: "The Bible is not a textbook on science." We agree that it is not; its main purpose is spiritual. Scientific facts are mentioned in popular language and only in their

religious bearing. However, when the assertion is made that the Bible is erroneous in its statements, we must demur. It is singularly guarded from such mistakes as Plato's idea that the earth was an intelligent being; as the thought of the Ancient Sages that the Milky Way was a path showing the footsteps of the Sun, or a band of solid substance joining the two parts of the globe; as the old notions that brutes are human beings in changed shapes. Its scientific parallelism is in striking contrast with the nebulous, vague and contradictory utterances of the so-called Babylonian Creation Tablets where one makes the beast the first creation and another puts man as the beginning; or, with the Hindu idea that the world is a flat triangular plain, resting on the heads of elephants whose feet rest on the shell of an immense tortoise and the tortoise on the coil of a great snake; and when these elephants shake themselves earthquakes occur.

Any one who examines the Bible with an humble and a reverent mind and compares its teachings with the ascertained facts (not the conjectures) of modern research must have his faith in the Book confirmed. Every disputed issue of the Bible upon which the archeologist has thrown any light has been established. The statements of the opening chapter of Genesis, the storm center of the controversy, are in accord with what is known to-day. Prof. Alphonso Smith, of the U. S. Naval Academy, says: "It is the one chapter in the Bible

that has made science possible. It is the magna charta of science." To quote Dr. Francis Smith, distinguished long-time teacher of Natural Science in the University of Virginia: "The writer of the first chapter of Genesis shows a correspondence, not with the science of his time, but with that of three thousand years later, which the accepted doctrine of probabilities makes it impossible to attribute to a fortunate guess." One does not have to be an erudite scholar to understand this. Long and high-sounding words are not needed to prove the proposition.

Genesis says: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." No definite time is fixed,—whether six thousand years or six million years. The time is expressly indefinite and gives a place for all that geology may discover. It was revealed to the historian that God was the source of all. The mind of the typical man rests upon that explanation. He knows there must have been a first cause; his intellectual faculties demand an adequate cause for every effect; his experience and observation agree with these faculties; he is in a universe of insoluble riddle without the first verse of the Bible; with that verse he has the solution in a personal Being who is sufficient for all things. The bewildered Darwin, in his experimentations, reached his limit and held up his hands with the exclamation that behind all may be a "somewhat." Herbert Spencer's nearest approach to a personal God was the recognition of

an "Infinite and Eternal Energy" from which all things proceed. Huxley contemptuously dismisses the subject of Deity with the words: "It is but the weary clatter of endless logomachy." I do not worship the "somewhat" of Darwin nor the "Eternal Energy" of Spencer; I worship the one true and living God who satisfies my reason and answers the requirements of my conscience. His revealed ways are not wearying to my soul. "They are my meditation day and night."

The scientist is unable to account for matter, he is impotent to create matter or life. Neither can he unravel the mystery of the process of development. How did invertebrates develop backbones and mammals develop breasts? Explain the origin and transmission of the eye,—the most perfect mechanism known to man. The simplest Christian with his Bible can tell more about origins than Darwin, Huxley, Spencer, and Tyndall all together. Upon this one phase of the subject he knows more than they by searching could find out. "By faith we understand that the worlds have been framed by the word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which appear," Heb. 11:3. The first chapter of Genesis gives an authoritative account of the primal source of matter, life and species. Why should a Christian exchange a rational account of the origin of matter, life, and species for the barren negations, illogical conjectures, audacious dogmatisms and poisonous gases of skeptical

scientists? Why should he not the rather confidently walk with Pascal, the prince of French writers, the peer of all scientists, and the finest of mathematicians, in the proved paths of the satisfying Scriptures?

Consider the order of the creation of life. According to the first chapter of Genesis, vegetable life appeared first, fish and fowl second, vertebrate animals third, and man fourth and last. That order is in agreement with the known facts of geology. The earliest form of life found in earth's grave is sea weed. Plants in abundance appeared before animals. Scientifically, this is necessarily so for animals could not subsist upon mineral matter. Animals feed upon plants or other animals. The horse cannot directly assimilate minerals; he must be fed upon corn, oats, hay, alfalfa —these must exist before he can subsist. This is common sense and Scripture. "And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth; and it was so," Gen. 1:11.

The second order in Genesis is recorded: "And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creatures that have life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven." Geology teaches that the first animals were the shell fish. Later, fish with a backbone appear and still later the frog and reptile. So much is not known scientifically about birds, but

they undoubtedly preceded mammals. How did the author of Genesis happen to hit upon the order which geology and biology discover? There is but one sufficient answer: God made it known to him.

The third order in Genesis is vertebrate animals: "And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind; and it was so. And God made the beast of earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the earth after his kind; and God saw that it was good," Gen. 1:24, 25. The non-Christian geologist must concede that mammals appeared after plants and fish, and before man. He must also admit that there is no evidence in the rocks of unbroken progression, of intermediate forms, of transitional stages among various species. He should see that the conclusion of his own investigation requires either creation or metamorphosis,—not evolution. Darwin admitted the force of this reasoning: "Geology, assuredly, does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this perhaps is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory." The Bible account is not disproved but rather strengthened by true science. I protest against that preaching or teaching which treats the Biblical account of creation as absurd. Point out the absurdity. Do not deal in glittering generalities, in sneering innuendoes, in veiled reflections, in smiling ridicule.

Specify the particulars and present the evidence. Moses was better informed than his critics. Genesis anticipates the latest science.

Once more, Genesis places man as the last and highest order in creation. "And God said, Let us make man in our image after our likeness," Gen. 1:26. To quote Professor Keyser: "First came the oblique forms of life, which were obviously vegetable; then the primal forms of animal life; then the higher forms; lastly man himself like a crown upon the pedestal of creation."

Contrast the language used in the creation of man with the language used in the creation of plants, of fish, of beasts. A dignity is conferred upon man: "Thou hast made him but little lower than God," Psalms 8:5. Between him and the highest order of beasts there is a vast chasm. Hence, no beast could be his consort; God made him a companion, a gentle woman.

Man, as portrayed in the Bible, is a rational, moral, social, spiritual being; he is the only earthly creature with religious feeling, moral sense and perception of the sublime. Such he has been as remotely as history traces him. Such he is now. He is conscious of an impassable gulf separating himself from the lower animals. He is, and has ever been, their superior and master. Argue as much as you please about fossils, speculate to your heart's content about processes, the everyday man has an intuitive and ineradicable conviction that he is above and over all other ani-

mals, that he has something within him not akin to them, that his destiny is diverse from theirs. The only explanation I have ever seen of this difference which appeals to my reason is the one contained in the Bible. Why apologize for the Biblical account? Why call it allegorical when it is inseparably connected with the succeeding history? Why not proclaim its accuracy since it satisfies intellect and conscience and without it we are in a hopeless muddle?

Go as far back into the past as you can and man is not very unlike the man of the present. A Columbia University professor recently had the candor to say that "all our research fails to reveal any development or material change in the intellectual, physical, or moral nature of man from his remotest historical appearance until the present." If we could trace man back to the first man my belief is that we would find the first will resemble the last. Those who have a theory to prove have sought in vain for a fossil that clearly proves man's animal origin. The best they can produce is the Java specimen with their far-fetched conclusions. Why, four thousand years from now, if the world stands so long, some speculative and illogical geologist may find the skeleton of a deformed negro of flat forehead, club feet, six toes and fingers, such as you may have seen in the flesh, and exhibit that skeleton to prove that the people of the twentieth century were that type.

There is another expression, used more than

once in the first chapter of Genesis, the truth of which we may see every day. It is where God says that a thing shall bear "after his kind, whose seed is in itself." That is being demonstrated before our eyes daily. The persistence of type of species, the resistance to change, is apparent to every observer. You plant wheat and you reap wheat; you do not reap oats. You hatch turkeys from the eggs of a turkey; you do not hatch chickens, not even when a chicken hen sits on turkey eggs. Who ever got a canary bird from the egg of a pigeon? You breed dogs and you get pups; you do not get kittens, nor can you breed dogs and cats and get a hybrid. The mule is a hybrid permitted by God for the utility of man; but the mule, whether male or female, cannot propagate. Hybrids are invariably sterile. An official of the British Museum is quoted as saying: "In all this great museum there is not a particle of evidence of the transmutation of species."

God's law, "after its kind," is so strongly in force that every one familiar with animal life recognizes its uniformity and universality. These easily observed things in nature are more in harmony with the traditional interpretation of Scripture than are they with the theories of the evolutionist. If transmutation has been the method, if one species originated from a different species, why does not transmutation go on before our eyes? Why did the Hippus, the boldly proclaimed progenitor of the horse, remain a Hippus from its

origin to its extinction? Clearly because the Hippus was always a Hippus. So with man: since God made the first one he has been a man. Does some one ejaculate "fogyism"? Then let him take the lowest man and the highest monkey and by interbreeding these near relatives produce an offspring and thus demonstrate his theory. Until that is done I must walk in the light of the Bible, experience and common sense.

Elsewhere I have shown that a special creative act of God occurred three times in the first chapter of Genesis precisely where science has the missing links: the origin of matter, the origin of life, and the origin of soul. I do not intend to repeat that evidence here but it is significant that a chapter written centuries before the discoveries of modern science contains the data which science confesses is wanting in its sphere. Genesis reverently understood and Geology properly taught, fit each other as glove and hand. One's patience is tried by the superficial and frequently blatant talk about the allegorical and unscientific language of Genesis; by the extravagant pulpit estimates of men who rejected the Bible; by the laudation of alleged scientific methods to the disparagement of the faith of our fathers.

Instead of emphasizing names and expounding theories which discredit the Book, we should, when occasion admits, dwell on the phenomenal fact that in this record written centuries before science unveiled the modern truths of nature there

is not one scientific blunder or error. We should rejoice that the coincidences and correspondences are so many and so marked that a modern scientist has confessed that "if one should sketch briefly the celestial mechanism of LaPlace, the Cosmos of Humboldt and the latest system of geology, no simpler and sublimer words could be found than those of Moses." We should cling to the Bible on the very first page of which the cardinal truths of our faith are indelibly written; the existence, unity, personality, wisdom, power, government, and goodness of God; the gradual, consecutive, cumulative, and harmonious processes of nature; the origin, free agency, mission, sovereignty and immortality of man. We should hold with tenacious faith the Book of books, the first sentence of which lays the ax at the root of the tree of atheism by announcing God; of polytheism by declaring his oneness; of pantheism by declaring his personality and transcendence; of deism by declaring his activity and government; of agnosticism by positive statements of knowledge; of materialism by affirming the creation of matter and the supremacy of spirit; and of rationalism by presenting the ultimate religious truth as a revelation.

It is not fair to say that the Bible and science are at war. The outcry of hostility is occasioned by misunderstanding and speculation. Misunderstanding: there is an essential difference between the ground of evangelical knowledge and the

ground of scientific knowledge. They represent two hemispheres of the world of truth. One is based upon experience, the other is based upon experiment. A personal experience in one and an accurate experiment in the other will not be contradictory; for what God reveals in his word and in his work necessarily harmonize when both are understood. Speculation: some man with an hypothesis to prove supposes he has found out some new fact and hastens to announce it. An amusing incident occurred in Louisiana a little while ago. Near Shreveport, road builders unearthed some enormous bones in a deep cut they were making through a hill. Wide attention was attracted by the bones. Geologists inspected them and pronounced their verdict with assurance; the remains of some enormous prehistoric animal. They spoke with such finality that their opinion was generally accepted. It was proposed to raise a fund to mount these bones for exhibition in a museum. Unexpectedly, something transpired; an unsophisticated farmer read about the bones in the papers. One day he went to town, called upon an editor and enquired: "Why all this ado about those bones?" The editor asked if he knew anything about them. "Surely," he said, and then told that years ago Barnum and Bailey gave a circus in Shreveport, that one of their largest elephants died, that they secured a permit from him to bury it on his place, and that it was buried on the hill through which the road was cut. Exit the

theorists, while laughter convulsed the public.

We do well to recall Luther's text: "For ever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven," Psalm 119:89. He had it written in charcoal on the walls of his chamber, and wrought in embroidery on the dress of his servants. Earthly changes reach not the heavenly sphere; and there the Word of God is fixed beyond the touch of disturbing fingers. Modern science has upset the notions of centuries but it is unable to prove the testimony of the Bible to be false. In honesty it should admit the concord between what God has revealed in the ages of the rocks and in the Rock of Ages.

We also do well to recall that the Lord of Life, the One who broke the bands of the grave and crushed the skull of death, put his imprimatur upon the Old Testament. His own words are: "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for Moses wrote of me," John 5:46; "For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth," Matt. 12:40; "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled," Matt. 5:18. Christ not only put his stamp upon the Old Testament, he preauthenticated the New Testament, John 16:12-15. One cannot destroy the validity of the Bible without impeaching the authority of Christ.

The Bible is the world's most marvelous book.

The more it is studied the more marvelous it appears. It is marvelous that it used in the creation account a word for day (yom) which means an indefinite period of time. (Compare Gen. 2:4; Ps. 95:8; John 8:46.) It is marvelous that in the same account the day begins with evening, and chemical light precedes the appearance of the sun, just as geology teaches that the first light was cosmical. It is marvelous that, though Hipparchus fixed the number of stars at 1,022, and Ptolemy at 1,026, twenty-two hundred years before Galileo turned the telescope on the heavens and disclosed innumerable stars, Jeremiah said: "The host of heaven cannot be numbered." It is marvelous that, several thousand years before Copernicus, Kepler, and Galileo taught the true law of the solar system, Job taught that the earth is not flat (26:7) and that the movements of the heavenly bodies do not vary (38:12). It is marvelous that, though philosophers like Aristotle and Bacon did not believe the air had weight and thirty centuries before the discovery that it did, the oldest book in the Bible should say: "To make the weight for the winds (atmosphere)," Job 28:25. It is marvelous that, long before Redfield announced his theory of storms showing that they were not lawless, Solomon should say substantially the same thing, Eccles. 1:6. It is marvelous that, centuries before uninspired man discovered the law of evaporation and explained how the waters which

flow to the sea do not overflow, but return in vapor to water the land, the Bible should state the fact explicitly: "All the rivers run into the sea; yet the sea is not full; unto the place from whence the rivers came, thither they return again," Eccles. 1:7. It is marvelous that twenty-six centuries before Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood the Bible should, in a poetic description of death, describe the spinal marrow (the silver cord), the skull which encloses the brain (the golden bowl), the lungs (the pitcher at the fountain), the heart (the wheel at the cistern)—a "wheel pumping up through one pipe to discharge through another," Eccles. 12:6 f. So marvelous are these and other facts that so competent an authority as Sir John Herschel expressed the opinion: "All human discoveries seem to be made only for the purpose of confirming more strongly the truths that have come down from on high and are contained in the sacred writings."

"Were all the seas one chrysolite,
The earth a golden ball,
And diamonds all the stars of night,
His book were worth them all."

The Bible is a fortress which has withstood every attack from Celsus to Percy Stickney Grant. Men have hurled against it the paper wads of their own fanciful theories ignited from their own powder. There it stands like Jackson at Man-

and permanent difficulties will enter into the very structure of their maturer lives and steady them; that when they shall have felt the broken heart and found the balm in Gilead, the only balm, that when they shall "have passed through the Valley of Humiliation and emerged victorious at the other end, they will not be greatly troubled by science and destructive criticism." But, what are we to do with them in the meantime? What is to become of them in all the days intervening before the lightning falls on the roof tree, or the Angel of Death spreads his black wings over their homes? This much at least we can do; be patient and sympathetic, be intelligently interested in their perplexities, be equipped with the armor of faith for every friendly combat, concede nothing vital, more closely inspect the teaching in the schools, and trust that in God's own good time he will bring them his way.

THE END

DATE DUE

BT 201 .M19 1924

McDaniel, George White, 1875
-1927.

The supernatural Jesus

SEMINARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BT201.M19 1924
McDaniel, Geo The supernatural Jesus /
3 0645 0006 2446 6